

MINIMAL FUNCTIONS ON THE RANDOM GRAPH

MANUEL BODIRSKY AND MICHAEL PINSKER

ABSTRACT. We show that there is a system of 14 non-trivial finitary functions on the random graph with the following properties: Any non-trivial function on the random graph generates one of the functions of this system by means of composition with automorphisms and by topological closure, and the system is minimal in the sense that no subset of the system has the same property. The theorem is obtained by proving a Ramsey-type theorem for colorings of tuples in finite powers of the random graph, and by applying this to find regular patterns in the behavior of any function on the random graph. As model-theoretic corollaries of our methods we re-derive a theorem of Simon Thomas classifying the first-order closed reducts of the random graph, and prove some refinements of this theorem; also, we obtain a classification of the minimal reducts closed under primitive positive definitions, and prove that all reducts of the random graph are model-complete.

1. INTRODUCTION

The random graph. The *random graph* (also called the *Rado graph*) is the countably infinite graph $G = (V; E)$ defined uniquely up to isomorphism by the *extension property*: For all finite disjoint subsets U, U' of the countably infinite vertex set V there exists a vertex $v \in V \setminus (U \cup U')$ such that v is in G adjacent to all vertices in U and to no vertex in U' . It follows that G is ω -categorical: every countable model of the first-order theory of G is isomorphic to G . For the many other remarkable properties of the graph G and its automorphism group $\text{Aut}(G)$, and various connections to many branches of mathematics, see e.g. [14, 15].

Minimal functions. We say that a finitary operation $f : V^k \rightarrow V$ *generates* (over $\text{Aut}(G)$) an operation $g : V^l \rightarrow V$ iff for every finite subset S of V^l there exists an operation obtained from f , the automorphisms of G , and projections by functional composition which agrees with g on the subset S . Equivalently, g is in the topological closure of the set of term functions that can be built from f and $\text{Aut}(G)$, where the topology on functions is just the natural convergence topology.

By this relation of function generation, the functions on the random graph are quasi-ordered with respect to their “generating strength”. The weakest functions in this order are the *trivial functions*, which we define to be those functions that are generated by the identity $\text{id} : V \rightarrow V$; roughly, these trivial functions are the automorphisms of G with possible additional dummy variables. On the next level are the *minimal functions*: An operation f is called *minimal* iff it is non-trivial, and all non-trivial functions g it generates have at least the arity of f and generate f . Simon Thomas proved in [29] that there are exactly two minimal unary bijective

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 03C10; secondary 05C80; 08A35; 05C55; 03C40.

Key words and phrases. Random graph, ω -categoricity, minimal function, Ramsey theory, automorphism, endomorphism, polymorphism, local clone, model-completeness, first-order definition, existential positive definition, primitive positive definition.

The second author is grateful for support through Erwin Schrödinger Fellowship J2742-N18 of the Austrian Science Fund and through an APART-fellowship of the Austrian Academy of Sciences.

operations on the random graph that do not generate each other. In this paper we generalize this to arbitrary finitary operations, and show that there are exactly 14 minimal operations over $\text{Aut}(G)$ that do not generate each other: these are a constant operation, an operation that maps G injectively to a complete subgraph of G , an operation that maps G injectively to an independent subset of G , the two operations considered by Thomas, and nine binary injective operations.

Ramsey theory. In our proof, we apply in a systematic way structural Ramsey theory. Any function $f : V \rightarrow V$ induces a coloring of the edges of the random graph by three colors: each edge might either be sent to an edge, to a non-edge, or be collapsed to a single vertex. Similarly, f induces a coloring of the non-edges. If f is not unary, but a function from a power V^n to V , then it induces colorings of n -tuples of edges, and so on. We will use a theorem of Nešetřil and Rödl from [22, 23] (and independently by [1]) which states that finite ordered vertex-colored graphs form a Ramsey class, in order to prove a Ramsey-type theorem which in turn allows us to find regular patterns in these colorings, for any function f . This makes it feasible to understand the generating process of functions; in particular, all minimal functions turn out to have *canonical* behavior in the sense that seen from the right perspective, the colorings they induce are all constant.

Groups, monoids, clones. The (topologically) closed permutation groups containing $\text{Aut}(G)$ form a complete lattice, with the meet of a set of groups being their intersection. Similarly, the closed transformation monoids containing $\text{Aut}(G)$, as well as the closed clones (that is, sets of finitary functions which are closed under composition and which contain all finitary projections) containing $\text{Aut}(G)$ form complete lattices. By determining the minimal functions on the random graph, we in fact find the atoms of these lattices, as they are generated by such minimal functions. In the group case, it turns out that if one continues “climbing up” in the lattice, i.e., if after the atoms of the lattice one determines the next level and so on, one finds the whole lattice as the lattice has only five elements. This was shown already by Thomas in [29], and we will re-derive this result. Our methods allow also to follow the same strategy for the other two lattices, but the iteration does not terminate as these lattices have infinite height.

Model theory: Reducts of the random graph. Results about operations on the random graph G yield model-theoretic results about *reducts* of G , i.e., about structures that have a first-order definition in G ; this is particularly true because G is ω -categorical. In fact, if we consider two reducts equivalent iff they first-order define one another, then the lattice of all reducts, factored by this equivalence, is antiisomorphic to the lattice of closed permutation groups that contain $\text{Aut}(G)$. Similarly, the finer lattice of reducts up to *existential positive interdefinability* corresponds to the lattice of closed transformation monoids that contain $\text{Aut}(G)$. Finally, the lattice of reducts factored by the even finer equivalence of *primitive positive interdefinability* (a first-order formula is *primitive positive* iff it contains no negations, disjunctions, and universal quantifications), corresponds to the lattice of closed clones that contain $\text{Aut}(G)$.

Using the latter connection, we obtain the following result for reducts: Call such a reduct *pp-complete* if every first-order formula is equivalent to a primitive positive formula, and *pp-incomplete* otherwise. We determine, up to primitive positive interdefinability, all pp-incomplete reducts Γ where every expansion of Γ by a relation that is not primitive positive

definable in Γ is pp-complete; there are 14 such structures, each corresponding to one of the minimal operations mentioned above.

As another application of the techniques in this paper we re-derive the full result of Thomas from [29], which is in fact a classification of the reducts of G up to *first-order interdefinability*. We show that the result can be strengthened to obtain a classification of those structures up to *existential interdefinability*. Finally, we show that all reducts Γ of G are model-complete, i.e., all self-embeddings of a reduct Γ are elementary.

We believe that our approach is canonical, and that the proof techniques can very well be adapted to show similar classifications of reducts up to existential interdefinability.

Universal algebra: Clones. A central concept in universal algebra is that of a *clone* [26, 28]. A clone $\mathcal{C}$ over domain D (finite or infinite) is a subset of the set $\mathcal{O}$ of all finitary operations on D which is closed under compositions of operations and which contains the projections. The notion of a clone generalizes that of a monoid, considered as a set of selfmaps of a set D which is closed under composition and contains the identical mapping.

The set of all clones over D forms a complete lattice with respect to set-theoretical inclusion. Although there exist results about the lattice of all clones even over an *infinite* domain D (see e.g. the survey article [17]), in many applications (e.g., in theoretical computer science), for infinite D one does not study the lattice of all clones, but the smaller lattice of those clones which are closed in the natural topology on $\mathcal{O}$. This topology, called the pointwise convergence topology, is given by the countable basis of sets of the form

$$\mathcal{O}_A^s := \{f \in \mathcal{O} \mid f|_A = s\},$$

where $A \subseteq D^n$ is finite and $s : A \rightarrow D$ is a finite function. This is reminiscent of the importance of closed permutation groups (rather than arbitrary permutation groups) for some applications (see e.g. [13]).

In universal algebra, the clones which are closed subsets of $\mathcal{O}$ in this topology are called *locally closed*, or just *local*. The lattice of local clones has been studied in [24, 25], and it turns out to be quite complicated. However, if we fix an oligomorphic permutation group $\mathcal{G}$ and consider the sublattice of all local clones that contain $\mathcal{G}$, then this sublattice is more manageable [2, 4], and techniques similar to those for clones over finite domains can be applied, in particular when classifying its atoms, which is often a goal.

It is easy to see that a clone $\mathcal{C} \supseteq \text{Aut}(G)$ is an atom in the lattice of local clones containing $\text{Aut}(G)$ iff there exists a minimal (in the sense above) operation f on G such that $\mathcal{C}$ is the smallest local clone containing the set $\{f\} \cup \text{Aut}(G)$ (“ $\mathcal{C}$ is the local clone generated by $\{f\}$ over $\text{Aut}(G)$ ”). Hence, here we determine all atoms of the lattice of local clones containing $\text{Aut}(G)$.

Computational complexity: Constraint satisfaction. Many computational problems in theoretical computer science can be elegantly formalized in the following way. Fix a structure Γ with finite relational signature. Then the *constraint satisfaction problem* for Γ ($\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$) is the problem of deciding whether a given primitive positive sentence is true in Γ . The computational complexity of $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ has been determined for all two-element structures in [27], for all three-element structures in [11], and for all structures with a first-order definition in $(\mathbb{Q}; <)$ in [7]. The results of the present paper provide the necessary mathematical results for a complexity classification for $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ when Γ has a first-order definition in the random graph; such constraint satisfaction problems constitute a generalization of Boolean constraint satisfaction problems to the language of graphs. We have to refer to the introduction of [4]

for a more detailed description of the general connection of reducts of ω -categorical structures with the CSP.

2. RESULTS

To state our results, we repeat the definition of *generation* in more detail. When $f : V^n \rightarrow V$ and $g_1, \dots, g_n : V^m \rightarrow V$ are operations, then the *composition* of f with $g_1, \dots, g_n$ is the operation defined by

$$(x_1, \dots, x_m) \mapsto f(g_1(x_1, \dots, x_m), \dots, g_n(x_1, \dots, x_m)) .$$

An operation $f : V^n \rightarrow V$ is called a *projection* iff there exists an $i \leq n$ such that $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_i$ for all $x_1, \dots, x_n \in V$. We say that a finitary operation $f : V^k \rightarrow V$ *generates* (over $\text{Aut}(G)$) an operation $g : V^l \rightarrow V$ iff for every finite subset of V the restriction of g equals the restriction of an operation that can be obtained from f , $\text{Aut}(G)$, and the projections by a sequence of compositions of operations.

We also repeat the definition of a *minimal function*: We say that $f : V^k \rightarrow V$ and $g : V^l \rightarrow V$ are *equivalent* if f generates g and g generates f . Call a function on V *trivial* iff it is equivalent to the identity function on V . Now define $f : V^n \rightarrow V$ to be *minimal* iff it is not trivial, and all non-trivial functions g generated by f have arity at least n and are equivalent to f .

We now define a small number of special operations on the random graph G . It is well-known that G is (*ultra-*) *homogeneous*, i.e., every isomorphism between two finite induced substructures of G can be extended to an automorphism of G (see [18, Theorem 6.4.4]). The random graph contains all countable graphs as induced subgraphs. In particular, the random graph contains an infinite complete subgraph, denoted by K_ω . It also follows from homogeneity of G that all injective operations from V to V whose image induces K_ω in G generate each other. Let e_E be one such injective operation. Similarly, G contains an infinite independent set, denoted by I_ω . Let e_N be an injective operation from $V \rightarrow V$ whose image induces I_ω in G .

It is clear that the complement graph of G (i.e., the graph on V obtained by switching edges and non-edges) is isomorphic to G . Again, note that by homogeneity of G all isomorphisms between G and its complement generate each other. Let $-$ be one such isomorphism.

For any finite non-empty subset S of V , if we flip edges and non-edges between S and $V \setminus S$ in G , then the resulting graph is isomorphic to G (it is straightforward to verify the extension property). All such isomorphisms generate each other. For each non-empty finite S , we let i_S be such an isomorphism. We also write sw for $i_{\{0\}}$, where $0 \in V$ is a fixed element for the rest of the paper, and refer to this operation as the *switch*.

To take a break from the definitions, we state the first part of our main theorem, which characterizes the minimal unary functions on G .

Theorem 1. *Let $e : V \rightarrow V$ be a minimal unary function on G . Then e is equivalent to exactly one of the following operations:*

- (1) *a constant operation;*
- (2) e_N ;
- (3) e_E ;
- (4) $-$;
- (5) sw .

We now turn to minimal functions of higher arity. In the following, let $f : V^2 \rightarrow V$ be a binary injective operation. The *dual* f^* of f is the operation defined by $f^*(x, y) = -f(-x, -y)$ (we write function applications of $-$ without braces). Clearly, $(f^*)^* = f$. We say that $f : V^2 \rightarrow V$ is

- of type p_1 iff for all $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in V$ with $x_1 \neq x_2$ and $y_1 \neq y_2$ we have $E(f(x_1, y_1), f(x_2, y_2))$ if and only if $E(x_1, x_2)$;
- of type $\max$ iff for all $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in V$ with $x_1 \neq x_2$ and $y_1 \neq y_2$ we have $E(f(x_1, y_1), f(x_2, y_2))$ if and only if $E(x_1, x_2)$ or $E(y_1, y_2)$;
- balanced in the first argument iff for all $x_1, x_2, y \in V$ with $x_1 \neq x_2$ we have $E(f(x_1, y), f(x_2, y))$ if and only if $E(x_1, x_2)$;
- balanced in the second argument iff $(x, y) \mapsto f(y, x)$ is balanced in the first argument;
- E -dominated in the first argument iff for all $x_1, x_2, y \in V$ with $x_1 \neq x_2$ we have that $E(f(x_1, y), f(x_2, y))$;
- E -dominated in the second argument iff $(x, y) \mapsto f(y, x)$ is E -dominated in the first argument.

We can now state our main result.

Theorem 2. *Let $e : V^k \rightarrow V$ be a minimal function on G . Then e is equivalent to one of the unary operations in Theorem 1, or to exactly one of the following operations:*

- (6) *a binary injection of type p_1 that is balanced in both arguments;*
- (7) *a binary injection of type $\max$ that is balanced in both arguments;*
- (8) *a binary injection of type $\max$ that is E -dominated in both arguments;*
- (9) *a binary injection of type p_1 that is E -dominated in both arguments;*
- (10) *a binary injection of type p_1 that is balanced in the first and E -dominated in the second argument;*

or to one of the duals of the last four operations (the operation in (6) is self-dual).

The technique to show this result can be applied several times to unary bijective operations in order to re-derive a result by Simon Thomas (Theorem 3 below). A monoid $\mathcal{M}$ of operations from a set D to D is called (locally) closed iff the following holds: whenever $f : D \rightarrow D$ is such that for every finite $A \subseteq D$ there exists $e \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $e(x) = f(x)$ for all $x \in A$, then f is an element of $\mathcal{M}$. Equivalently, the monoid is a closed set in the product topology of D^D , where D is taken to be discrete. For the purposes of this paper, we call the smallest closed transformation monoid that contains a set of operations $\mathcal{F}$ from V to V and the automorphism group $\text{Aut}(G)$ of the random graph the *monoid generated by $\mathcal{F}$* . Similarly, a permutation group $\mathcal{G}$ acting on D is called (locally) closed iff it is closed in the subspace of D^D consisting of all permutations on D ; equivalently, $\mathcal{G}$ contains all permutations which can be interpolated by elements of $\mathcal{G}$ on arbitrary finite subsets of D , as in the definition of a closed monoid above. As before, we call the smallest closed group containing a set of permutations $\mathcal{F}$ on V as well as $\text{Aut}(G)$ the *group generated by $\mathcal{F}$* .

Theorem 3 (of [29]). *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a closed permutation group containing $\text{Aut}(G)$. Then exactly one out of the following five cases is true.*

- (1) $\mathcal{G}$ equals $\text{Aut}(G)$.
- (2) $\mathcal{G}$ is the group generated by $-$.
- (3) $\mathcal{G}$ is the group generated by sw .
- (4) $\mathcal{G}$ is the group generated by $\{-, sw\}$.

- (5) $\mathcal{G}$ is the group of all permutations on V .

The arguments given in [29] use a Ramsey-theoretic result by Nešetřil [20], namely that the class of all finite graphs excluding finite cliques of a fixed size forms a *Ramsey class* (in the sense of [21]). We also use a Ramsey-theoretic result, shown by Rödl and Nešetřil [22, 23] (and independently by [1]), which is different: we need the fact that finite ordered vertex-colored graphs form a Ramsey class. Our proof moreover shows the following statement about closed transformation monoids that contain $\text{Aut}(G)$; this statement also follows from another combinatorial proof of Simon Thomas given in [30] (where he uses the notion of *pseudo-reducts* instead of a formulation in terms of closed monoids).

Theorem 4. *For any closed monoid $\mathcal{M}$ containing $\text{Aut}(G)$, one of the following cases applies.*

- (1) $\mathcal{M}$ contains a constant operation.
- (2) $\mathcal{M}$ contains e_E .
- (3) $\mathcal{M}$ contains e_N .
- (4) $\mathcal{M}$ is generated by (the closed group of) its permutations.

3. MODEL-THEORETIC COROLLARIES

We now discuss a model-theoretic interpretation of these results, and further model-theoretic consequences of the results. For relational structures Γ with a finite signature, homogeneity implies ω -categoricity: all countable models of the first-order theory of Γ are isomorphic (Corollary 6.4.2 of [18]). The *reducts* of an ω -categorical structure Γ (i.e., structures with the same domain as Γ all of whose relations can be defined from Γ by a first-order formula) are ω -categorical (see e.g. [18]). In particular, this is true for the reducts of the random graph. We say that two structures Γ and Δ are *first-order interdefinable* when Γ is first-order definable in Δ and vice versa.

Let $f : D^n \rightarrow D$ be an operation and let $R \subseteq D^m$ be a relation. We say that f *preserves* R iff $f(r_1, \dots, r_n) \in R$ whenever $r_1, \dots, r_n \in R$, where $f(r_1, \dots, r_n)$ is calculated componentwise. The theorem of Engeler, Ryll-Nardzewski, and Svenonius (see e.g. [18, Theorem 6.3.1]) states that a relation R is first-order definable in an ω -categorical structure Δ if and only if R is preserved by all automorphisms of Δ . As a consequence, the reducts of an ω -categorical structure Δ are, up to first-order interdefinability, in one-to-one correspondence with the locally closed permutation groups containing $\text{Aut}(\Delta)$. To illustrate this, we restate Theorem 3 by means of this connection.

On the random graph, let $R^{(k)}$ be the k -ary relation that holds on $x_1, \dots, x_k \in V$ iff $x_1, \dots, x_k$ are pairwise distinct, and the number of edges between these k vertices is odd. Note that $R^{(4)}$ is preserved by $-$, $R^{(3)}$ is preserved by sw , and that $R^{(5)}$ is preserved by $-$ and by sw , but not by all permutations of V .

Theorem 5 (of [29]). *Let Γ be a reduct of the random graph. Then exactly one out of the following five cases is true.*

- (1) Γ is first-order interdefinable with $(V; E)$.
- (2) Γ is first-order interdefinable with $(V; R^{(4)})$.
- (3) Γ is first-order interdefinable with $(V; R^{(3)})$.
- (4) Γ is first-order interdefinable with $(V; R^{(5)})$.
- (5) Γ is first-order interdefinable with $(V; =)$.

For any Γ , a case of Theorem 5 applies iff the case with the same number applies for $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ in Theorem 3. We will not prove this relational description in this paper; however, given Theorem 3 and the discussion above, verifying the equivalence is merely an exercise.

In the same way as automorphisms of an ω -categorical structure Δ can be used to characterize first-order definability in Δ , self-embeddings of Δ can be used to characterize existential definability, endomorphisms of Δ can be used to characterize existential positive definability, and polymorphisms of Δ (i.e., homomorphisms from a finite power Δ^n to Δ , or simply finitary operations preserving all relations of Δ) can be used to characterize primitive positive definability in Δ .

A first-order formula ϕ is called *existential* iff it is of the form $\exists x_1, \dots, x_k. \psi$, where ψ is quantifier-free. A first-order formula is called *primitive positive* (*existential positive*) iff it is existential and does not contain negations and disjunctions (negations, respectively). Call two structures Γ and Δ *primitive positive interdefinable* iff every relation in Γ has a definition by a primitive positive formula in Δ and vice versa; we have analogous definitions for existential positive and existential interdefinability. To translate results about operations on G into results about primitive positive definability in reducts of G , the following theorem is central.

Theorem 6 (from [8]). *Let Γ be an ω -categorical structure. Then a relation R is primitive positive definable in Γ if and only if R is preserved by the polymorphisms of Γ .*

The operational generating process can be linked to preservation of relations of structures [2, 4, 8].

Proposition 7. *Let $f : V^k \rightarrow V$ and $g : V^l \rightarrow V$ be operations. Then f generates g if and only if every relation with a first-order definition in G that is preserved by g is also preserved by f .*

Using these facts, we arrive at the following equivalent formulation of Theorem 2. Call a reduct Γ of G *pp-precomplete* iff it is pp-incomplete (as defined in the introduction) and every expansion of Γ by a relation that is not primitive positive definable in Γ is pp-complete. The *dual* of Γ is the structure that contains the relation $-R := \{(-t_1, \dots, -t_k) \mid (t_1, \dots, t_k) \in R\}$ for all relations R in Γ .

Theorem 8. *Let Γ be a pp-precomplete reduct of G . Then it is first-order interdefinable with exactly one of the following 14 structures:*

- (1) *The structure with all relations that are first-order definable in G and preserved by a constant operation;*
- (2) *The structure with all relations that are first-order definable in G and preserved by e_N ;*
- (3) *The structure with all relations that are first-order definable in G and preserved by e_E ;*
- (4) *The structure with all relations that are first-order definable in G and preserved by $-$;*
- (5) *The structure with all relations that are first-order definable in G and preserved by sw ;*
- (6) *The structure with all relations that are first-order definable in G and preserved by a binary operation of type p_1 that is balanced in both arguments;*
- (7) *The structure with all relations that are first-order definable in G and preserved by a binary operation of type $\max$ that is balanced in both arguments;*

- (8) *The structure with all relations that are first-order definable in G and preserved by a binary operation of type $\max$ that is E -dominated in both arguments;*
- (9) *The structure with all relations that are first-order definable in G and preserved by a binary operation of type p_1 that is E -dominated in both arguments;*
- (10) *The structure with all relations that are first-order definable in G and preserved by a binary operation of type p_1 that is balanced in the first and E -dominated in the second argument;*

or to one of the duals of the last four structures.

Existential positive and existential definability in an ω -categorical structure Γ can be described in terms of the endomorphism monoid of Γ .

Theorem 9. *A relation R has an existential positive (existential) definition in an ω -categorical structure Γ if and only if R is preserved by the endomorphisms (self-embeddings) of Γ .*

Proof. It is easy to verify that existential positive formulas are preserved by endomorphisms, and existential formulas are preserved by self-embeddings of Γ .

For the other direction, note that the endomorphisms and self-embeddings of Γ contain the automorphisms of Γ , and hence the theorem of Ryll-Nardzewski shows that R has a first-order definition in Γ ; let ϕ be a formula defining R . Suppose for contradiction that R is preserved by all endomorphisms of Γ but has no existential positive definition in Γ . We use the homomorphism preservation theorem (see [18, Section 5.5, Exercise 2]), which states that a first-order formula ϕ is equivalent to an existential positive formula modulo a first-order theory T if and only if ϕ is preserved by all homomorphisms between models of T . Since by assumption ϕ is not equivalent to an existential positive formula in Γ , there are models Γ_1 and Γ_2 of the first-order theory of Γ and a homomorphism h from Γ_1 to Γ_2 that violates ϕ . By the Theorem of Löwenheim-Skolem (see e.g. [18]) the first-order theory of the two-sorted structure $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2; h)$ has a countable model $(\Gamma'_1, \Gamma'_2; h')$. Since both Γ'_1 and Γ'_2 must be countably infinite, and because Γ is ω -categorical, we have that Γ'_1 and Γ'_2 are isomorphic to Γ , and h' can be seen as an endomorphism of Γ that violates ϕ ; a contradiction.

The argument for existential definitions and self-embeddings is similar, but instead of the homomorphism preservation theorem we use the Theorem of Los-Tarski which states that a first-order formula ϕ is equivalent to an existential formula modulo a first-order theory T if and only if ϕ is preserved by all embeddings between models of T (see e.g. [18, Corollary 5.4.5]). $\square$

Using Theorem 9, we obtain an interesting and perhaps surprising consequence of Theorem 4. A theory T is called *model-complete* iff every embedding between models of T is elementary, i.e., preserves all first-order formulas. It is well-known that a theory T is model-complete if and only if every first-order formula is modulo T equivalent to an existential formula (see [18, Theorem 7.3.1]). A structure is said to be model-complete iff its first-order theory is model-complete. From the definition of model-completeness and ω -categoricity it is easy to see that an ω -categorical structure Γ is model-complete iff all embeddings of Γ into itself preserve all first-order formulas.

Lemma 10. *An ω -categorical structure Γ is model-complete if and only if all self-embeddings of Γ are in the topological closure of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ in the space of unary functions on Γ .*

Proof. First assume that all self-embeddings of Γ are in the topological closure of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$. Let ϕ be a first-order formula. By the equivalent characterization of model-completeness

mentioned above it suffices to show that ϕ is equivalent to an existential formula. Since ϕ is preserved by automorphisms of Γ , it is also preserved by self-embeddings of Γ . Then Theorem 9 implies that ϕ is equivalent to an existential formula.

Conversely, suppose that all first-order formulas are equivalent to an existential formula in Γ . Since existential formulas are preserved by self-embeddings of Γ , also the first-order formulas are preserved by self-embeddings of Γ . Then the theorem of Engeler, Ryll-Nardzewski, and Svenonius shows that every relation that is preserved by all automorphisms of Γ is also preserved by the self-embeddings of Γ . Now if there were a self-embedding e not in the closure of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$, then there would be a finite tuple t in Γ such that $e(t) \neq \alpha(t)$ for all $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$. Let $R := \{\alpha(t) : \alpha \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)\}$. Then R is preserved by all automorphisms of Γ but not by e , a contradiction. $\square$

It follows from a result in [7, Proposition 19] (based on a proof of a result by Cameron [12] from [19]) that all reducts of the linear order of the rationals $(\mathbb{Q}; <)$ are model-complete. We now see that the same is true for the random graph.

Before that, we need to observe that G has *quantifier-elimination*: every first-order formula is in G equivalent to a quantifier-free first-order formula. This is because G is ω -categorical and homogeneous, and because in ω -categorical structures, homogeneity is equivalent to having quantifier-elimination (Theorem 2.22 in [13]).

Corollary 11. *All reducts of the random graph are model-complete.*

Proof. Let Γ be a reduct, and let $\mathcal{M}$ be the closed monoid of self-embeddings of Γ . By Lemma 10 it suffices to show that $\mathcal{M}$ is generated by $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ (since the closed monoid generated by $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ is just the topological closure of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ in the space of self-mappings on Γ). We apply Theorem 4. If Case (4) of the theorem holds, we are done. Note that $\mathcal{M}$ cannot contain a constant operation as all its operations are injective. So suppose that $\mathcal{M}$ contains e_N (the argument for e_E is analogous). Let R be any relation of Γ , and ϕ_R be its defining quantifier-free formula. Let ψ_R be the formula obtained by replacing all occurrences of E by *false*; so ψ_R is a formula over the empty language. Then a tuple a satisfies ϕ_R in G iff $e_N(a)$ satisfies ϕ_R in G (because e_N is an embedding) iff $e_N(a)$ satisfies ψ_R in G (as there are no edges on $e_N(a)$) iff $e_N(a)$ satisfies ψ_R in the substructure induced by $e_N[V]$ (since ψ_R does not contain any quantifiers). Thus, Γ is isomorphic to the structure on $e_N[V]$ which has the relations defined by the formulas ψ_R ; hence, Γ is isomorphic to a structure with a first-order definition over the empty language. This structure has, of course, all injections as self-embeddings, and all permutations as automorphisms, and hence is model-complete; thus, the same is true for Γ . $\square$

Although G has quantifier-elimination, the same is not true for its reducts. For example, any two 2-element substructures of the structure

$$\Gamma = (V; \{(x, y, z) \mid E(x, y) \wedge \neg E(y, z) \wedge y \neq z\})$$

are isomorphic. But since there is a first-order definition of G in Γ , an isomorphism between a 2-element substructure with an edge and a 2-element substructure without an edge cannot be extended to an automorphism of Γ . However, our results imply that a structure Γ with a first-order definition in the random graph is homogeneous when Γ is expanded by all relations with an existential definition in Γ .

Corollary 12. *Every reduct Γ of the random graph has quantifier-elimination if it is expanded by all relations with an existential definition in Γ .*

Proof. This follows directly from the model-completeness of Γ and the fact mentioned above that in model-complete structures first-order formulas are equivalent to existential formulas (see e.g. [18, Theorem 7.3.1]). $\square$

As another application, we refine Theorem 5 by giving a finer (at least in theory) classification of the reducts of the random graph.

Corollary 13. *Up to existential interdefinability, the random graph has exactly five reducts.*

Proof. In the same way as in the proof of Corollary 11, we can use Theorem 4 to show that either the self-embeddings of a reduct Γ are generated by the automorphisms, and Γ is existentially interdefinable with one of the structures described in Theorem 3; or otherwise Γ has an existential definition in $(V; =)$, which is again one of the five cases from Theorem 3. $\square$

The endomorphism monoid $\text{End}(G)$ of the random graph has been studied in [9, 10, 16]. By Theorem 9, studying closed transformation monoids containing $\text{End}(G)$ is equivalent to studying reducts of G up to existential positive interdefinability. A complete classification of all locally closed transformation monoids that contain all permutations of V , and hence of the reducts of $(V; =)$ up to existential positive interdefinability, has been given in [4]; there is only a countable number of such monoids. The results of the present paper are far from providing a full classification of the locally closed transformation monoids that contain the automorphisms of the random graph — this is left for future investigation.

4. ADDITIONAL NOTIONS, NOTATION, AND OTHER HINTS FOR READING THIS PAPER

We will write $E(x, y)$ or $xy \in E$ to express that two vertices $x, y \in V$ are adjacent in the random graph. The binary relation $N(x, y)$ is defined by $\neg E(x, y) \wedge x \neq y$. Pairs $\{x, y\}$ with $N(x, y)$ are referred to as *non-edges*.

Often when we have a graph $\mathcal{P} = (P; D)$, and $S \subseteq P$, then for notational simplicity we write $(S; D)$ for the subgraph of $\mathcal{P}$ induced by S , i.e., we ignore the fact that D would have to be restricted to S^2 .

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: In Section 5, we recall some Ramsey-type theorems and extend them for our purposes. We then apply these theorems to mappings from V to V in order to get hold of such mappings in Section 6. This allows us to determine the minimal unary functions in Section 7, where we also prove Theorems 3 and 4. Turning to functions of higher arity in Section 8, we show that minimal higher arity functions are always binary injections. In order to understand binary minimal functions, we develop further Ramsey-theoretic tools in Section 9. Finally, in Section 10, we determine the minimal binary injections, completing our proof.

5. RAMSEY-THEORETIC PRELIMINARIES

We recall some Ramsey-type theorems and extend these theorems for our purposes. This will allow us find patterns in colorings of edges and non-edges of graphs and of graphs equipped with additional structure.

We start by recalling a theorem on ordered structures due to Nešetřil and Rödl [22] of which we will make heavy use. Let $\tau = \tau' \cup \{<\}$ be a relational signature, and let $\mathcal{C}(\tau)$ be the class of all finite τ -structures $\mathcal{S}$ where $<$ denotes a linear order on the domain of $\mathcal{S}$. For τ -structures $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$, let $\binom{\mathcal{A}}{\mathcal{B}}$ be the set of all substructures of $\mathcal{A}$ that are isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}$ (we

also refer to members of $\binom{\mathcal{A}}{\mathcal{B}}$ as *copies of $\mathcal{B}$ in $\mathcal{A}$* . For a finite number $k \geq 1$, a k -coloring of the copies of $\mathcal{B}$ in $\mathcal{A}$ is simply a mapping χ from $\binom{\mathcal{A}}{\mathcal{B}}$ into a set of size k .

Definition 14. For $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{C}(\tau)$ and $k \geq 1$, we write $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow (\mathcal{H})_k^{\mathcal{P}}$ iff for every k -coloring χ of the copies of $\mathcal{P}$ in $\mathcal{S}$ there exists a copy $\mathcal{H}'$ of $\mathcal{H}$ in $\mathcal{S}$ such that all copies of $\mathcal{P}$ in $\mathcal{H}'$ have the same color (under χ).

Theorem 15 (of [1, 22, 23]). *The class $\mathcal{C}(\tau)$ of all finite relational ordered τ -structures is a Ramsey class, i.e., for all $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{C}(\tau)$ and $k \geq 1$ there exists $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{C}(\tau)$ such that $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow (\mathcal{H})_k^{\mathcal{P}}$.*

Corollary 16. *For every finite graph $\mathcal{H}$ and for all colorings χ_E and χ_N of the edges and the non-edges of the random graph G , respectively, by finitely many colors, there exists an isomorphic copy of $\mathcal{H}$ in G on which both colorings are constant.*

Proof. Let k be the number of colors used altogether by χ_E and χ_N . Let $\prec$ be any total order on the domain of $\mathcal{H}$, and denote the structure obtained from $\mathcal{H}$ by adding the order $\prec$ to the signature by $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$. Consider the complete graph $\mathcal{K}_2$ on two vertices, and order its two vertices anyhow to arrive at a structure $\bar{\mathcal{K}}_2$. Then the coloring χ_E of the edges of $\mathcal{H}$ can be viewed as a coloring of the copies of $\bar{\mathcal{K}}_2$ in $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$. Let $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ with $\bar{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow (\bar{\mathcal{H}})_k^{\bar{\mathcal{K}}_2}$ be provided by the preceding theorem, and let $\mathcal{S}$ be $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ without the order. Then $\mathcal{S}$ is a graph with the property that whenever we color its edges with k colors, then there is a copy of $\mathcal{H}$ in $\mathcal{S}$ all of whose edges have the same color. Now we repeat the argument for the non-edges, starting from $\mathcal{S}$ instead of $\mathcal{H}$. We then arrive at a graph $\mathcal{T}$ with the property that whenever we color its edges and non-edges by k colors, then there is a copy $\mathcal{H}'$ of $\mathcal{H}$ in $\mathcal{T}$ such that all edges of $\mathcal{H}'$ have the same color, and such that non-edges of $\mathcal{H}'$ have the same color. $\mathcal{T}$ has a copy in G , proving the claim. $\square$

We will not only need to color edges of graphs, but also of graphs equipped with additional structure.

Definition 17. An n -partitioned graph is a structure $\mathcal{U} = (U; F, U_1, \dots, U_n)$, where $(U; F)$ is a graph and each U_i is a subset of U such that the U_i form a partition of U .

Definition 18. Let $\mathcal{U} = (U; F)$ be a graph, and let S_1, S_2 be disjoint subsets of U . Let χ be a coloring of the two-element subsets of U . We say that χ is *canonical on S_1* iff the color of a two-element subset of S_1 depends only on whether this set is an edge or a non-edge. Similarly, we say that χ is *canonical between S_1 and S_2* iff the color of every pair $\{s_1, s_2\}$, where $s_1 \in S_1$ and $s_2 \in S_2$, depends only on whether or not this pair is an edge.

Definition 19. Let $\mathcal{U} = (U; F, U_1, \dots, U_n)$ be an n -partitioned graph. We say that a coloring of the two-element subsets of U is *canonical on $\mathcal{U}$* iff it is canonical on all U_i and between all distinct U_i, U_j .

Lemma 20 (The n -partitioned graph Ramsey lemma). *Let $n, k \geq 1$. For any finite n -partitioned graph $\mathcal{U} = (U; F, U_1, \dots, U_n)$ there exists a finite n -partitioned graph $\mathcal{Q} = (Q; D, Q_1, \dots, Q_n)$ with the property that for all colorings of the two-element subsets of Q with k colors, there exists a copy of $\mathcal{U}$ in $\mathcal{Q}$ on which the coloring is canonical.*

Proof. We show the lemma for $n = 2$; the generalization to larger n is straightforward. For $n = 2$, we apply Theorem 15 six times: Once for the edges in U_1 , once for the edges in U_2 , once for the edges between U_1 and U_2 , and then the same for all three kinds of non-edges.

In general, we would have to apply the theorem 2 ($n + \binom{n}{2}$) times: Once for the edges of each part U_i , once for the edges between any two distinct parts U_i, U_j , and then the same for all non-edges on and between parts.

So assume $n = 2$. We exhibit the idea in detail for the edges between U_1 and U_2 . Let $\prec$ be any total order on U with the property that $u_1 \prec u_2$ for all $u_1 \in U_1, u_2 \in U_2$. Consider the 2-partitioned graph $\mathcal{L}^1 = (\{a, b\}; \{(a, b), (b, a)\}, \{a\}, \{b\})$ and order its vertices by setting $a \prec b$; so $\mathcal{L}^1$ consists of two adjacent vertices which are ordered somehow, and which lie in different parts. By Theorem 15, there exists an ordered partitioned graph $\mathcal{Q}^1 = (Q^1; D^1, Q_1^1, Q_2^1, \prec)$ such that $\mathcal{Q}^1 \rightarrow (\mathcal{U})_k^{\mathcal{L}^1}$.

Now, if we change the order on $\mathcal{Q}^1$ in such a way that $r \prec s$ for all $r \in Q_1^1$ and all $s \in Q_2^1$ and such that the order within the parts Q_1^1, Q_2^1 remains unaltered, then the statement $\mathcal{Q}^1 \rightarrow (\mathcal{U})_k^{\mathcal{L}^1}$ still holds: For, given a coloring of the copies of $\mathcal{L}^1$ with respect to the new ordering, we obtain a coloring of (possibly fewer) copies of $\mathcal{L}^1$ with respect to the old ordering. There, we obtain a copy $\mathcal{U}'$ of $\mathcal{U}$ such that all copies of $\mathcal{L}^1$ in $\mathcal{U}'$ have the same color. But in this copy, by the choice of the order on $\mathcal{U}$, we have that $r \prec s$ for all $r \in U_1'$ and all $s \in U_2'$. Therefore, this copy is also a substructure of $\mathcal{Q}^1$ with respect to the new ordering.

Since we can change the ordering on $\mathcal{Q}^1$ in the way described above, the colorings of the copies of $\mathcal{L}^1$ are just colorings of those pairs $\{r, s\}$, with $r \in Q_1^1$ and $s \in Q_2^1$, which are edges.

Now we repeat the process with the structure $\mathcal{L}^2 = (\{a, b\}; \{(a, b), (b, a)\}, \{a, b\}, \emptyset)$, ordered again by setting $a \prec b$, starting with $\mathcal{Q}^1$. We then obtain a structure $\mathcal{Q}^2$; this step takes care of the edges which lie within U_1 . After that we proceed with $\mathcal{L}^3 = (\{a, b\}; \{(a, b), (b, a)\}, \emptyset, \{a, b\})$, thereby taking care of the edges within U_2 . We then apply Theorem 15 three more times with the structures $\mathcal{L}^4 = (\{a, b\}; \emptyset, \{a\}, \{b\})$, $\mathcal{L}^5 = (\{a, b\}; \emptyset, \{a, b\}, \emptyset)$, and $\mathcal{L}^6 = (\{a, b\}; \emptyset, \emptyset, \{a, b\})$, in order to ensure homogeneous non-edges. $\square$

The preceding lemma on partitioned graphs was an auxiliary tool to cope with graphs which have some distinguished vertices, as defined in the following.

Definition 21. An n -constant graph is a structure $\mathcal{U} = (U; F, u_1, \dots, u_n)$, where $\mathcal{U} = (U; F)$ is a graph, and $u_i \in U$ are distinct.

Observe that n -constant graphs are no relational structures; therefore, in order to apply Theorem 15, we have to make them relational: To every n -constant graph $\mathcal{U} = (U; F, u_1, \dots, u_n)$ we can assign an $n + 2^n$ -partitioned graph $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} = (U; F, \{u_1\}, \dots, \{u_n\}, U_1, \dots, U_{2^n})$ in which the u_i belong to singleton sets, and in which for every possible relative position (edge or non-edge) to the u_i we have a set U_j of all elements in $U \setminus \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ having this position. (In the language of model theory, every of the $n + 2^n$ sets corresponds to a maximal quantifier-free 1-type over the structure $\mathcal{U}$.) We call the parts U_i the *proper* parts of $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$.

Definition 22. Let $\mathcal{U} = (U; F, u_1, \dots, u_n)$ be an n -constant graph. We say that a coloring of the two-element subsets of U is *canonical on $\mathcal{U}$* iff it is canonical on the corresponding $n + 2^n$ -partitioned graph.

We now arrive at the goal of this section, namely the following lemma, which we are going to apply to operations on the random graph numerous times in the sections to come.

Lemma 23 (The n -constant graph Ramsey lemma). *Let $n, k \geq 1$. For any finite n -constant graph $\mathcal{U} = (U; F, u_1, \dots, u_n)$ there exists a finite n -constant graph $\mathcal{Q} = (Q; D, q_1, \dots, q_n)$ with the property that for all colorings of the two-element subsets of Q with k colors, there exists a copy of $\mathcal{U}$ in $\mathcal{Q}$ on which the coloring is canonical.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} := (U; F, \{u_1\}, \dots, \{u_n\}, U_1, \dots, U_{2^n})$ be the partitioned graph associated with $\mathcal{U}$. We would like to use the partitioned graph Ramsey lemma (Lemma 20) in order to obtain $\mathcal{Q}$; but we want the singleton sets $\{u_i\}$ of the partition to remain singletons, which is not guaranteed by that lemma.

So consider the 2^n -partitioned graph $\mathcal{R} := (U \setminus \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}; F, U_1, \dots, U_{2^n})$, and apply the partitioned graph Ramsey lemma to this graph to obtain a partitioned graph $\mathcal{R}^0$.

Equip $\mathcal{R}^0$ with any linear order. Now consider the ordered 2^n -partitioned graph $\mathcal{L}^1$ which has just one vertex, and whose first part contains this single vertex. Apply Theorem 15 in order to obtain an ordered partitioned graph $\mathcal{R}^1$ such that $\mathcal{R}^1 \rightarrow (\mathcal{R}^0)_{k^n}^{\mathcal{L}^1}$.

Next, consider the ordered 2^n -partitioned graph $\mathcal{L}^2$ which has just one vertex, and whose second part contains this single vertex. Apply Theorem 15 in order to obtain an ordered partitioned graph $\mathcal{R}^2$ such that $\mathcal{R}^2 \rightarrow (\mathcal{R}^1)_{k^n}^{\mathcal{L}^2}$.

Repeat this procedure with the ordered 2^n -partitioned graphs $\mathcal{L}^3, \dots, \mathcal{L}^{2^n}$; $\mathcal{L}^i$ has its single vertex in its i -th part. We end up with an ordered partitioned graph $\mathcal{R}^{2^n}$. We now forget its order and denote the resulting structure by $\mathcal{T} = (T; C, T_1, \dots, T_{2^n})$.

$\mathcal{T}$ has the following property: Whenever we color its vertices with k^n colors, then we find a copy of $\mathcal{R}^0$ in $\mathcal{T}$ such that the coloring is constant on each part of this copy. Hence, it has the property that if we color its two-element subsets and its vertices with k and k^n colors, respectively, then we find in it a copy of $\mathcal{R}$ on which the first coloring is canonical, and such that the color of the vertices depends only on the part the vertex lies in.

Now consider the structure $\mathcal{S} := (T \cup \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}; B, \{u_1\}, \dots, \{u_n\}, T_1, \dots, T_{2^n})$, where B consists of the edges of $\mathcal{T}$, plus edges connecting the u_i with the vertices of some parts T_i , depending on whether u_i was in $\mathcal{U}$ connected to the vertices in U_i or not. Clearly, $\mathcal{S}$ is the partitioned graph of the n -constant graph $\mathcal{Q} := (T \cup \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}; B, u_1, \dots, u_n)$. We claim that $\mathcal{Q}$ has the property we want to prove. Assume that we color the two-element subsets of $T \cup \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ with k colors. We must find a copy of $\mathcal{U}$ in $\mathcal{Q}$ on which the coloring is canonical. Divide the coloring into two colorings, namely the coloring restricted to two-element subsets of T , and the coloring of two-element subsets which contain at least one element u_i outside T . The color of the sets $\{u_i, u_j\}$ completely outside T is irrelevant for what we want to prove, so forget about these.

Now the coloring of those sets which have exactly one element outside T can be encoded in a coloring of the vertices of T : Each vertex is given one of k^n colors, depending on the colors of its edges leading to $u_1, \dots, u_n$. So we have encoded the original coloring into a coloring of two-elements subsets of T and a coloring of the vertices of T . With our observation above, this proves the lemma. $\square$

6. FINDING STRUCTURE IN MAPPINGS ON THE RANDOM GRAPH

In this section we show how to use the Ramsey-theoretic results from the last section in our context. That is, we will use those results in order to find regular patterns in the behavior of unary functions from V to V . To warm up, we prove a simple observation (Proposition 26) applying Corollary 16. The proposition states that any unary mapping on the random graph behaves quite simple on copies of arbitrary finite subgraphs.

Definition 24. Let $e, f : V \rightarrow V$. We say that e *behaves as* f *on* $F \subseteq V$ iff there is an automorphism α of G such that $f(x) = \alpha(e(x))$ for all $x \in F$. We say that e *interpolates* f *modulo automorphisms* iff for every finite $F \subseteq V$ there is an automorphism β of G such that

$e(\beta(x))$ behaves as f on F ; so this is the case iff there exist automorphisms α, β such that $\alpha(e(\beta(x))) = f(x)$ for all $x \in F$.

Note that if e interpolates f modulo automorphisms, then it also generates f . We now want to make precise what it means that arbitrarily large structures have a certain property.

Definition 25. Let τ be any signature and let $\mathcal{C}(\tau)$ be a class of finite τ -structures closed under substructures and with the property that for any two structures in $\mathcal{C}(\tau)$ there exists a structure in $\mathcal{C}(\tau)$ containing both structures. We order $\mathcal{C}(\tau)$ by the embedding relation $\subseteq$. Let $P(w)$ be any property. We say that P holds for arbitrarily large elements of $\mathcal{C}(\tau)$ iff for any $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}(\tau)$ there exists $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{C}(\tau)$ such that $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ and $P(\mathcal{H})$ holds. We say that P holds for all sufficiently large elements of $\mathcal{C}(\tau)$ iff there is an element $\mathcal{F}$ of $\mathcal{C}(\tau)$ such that P holds for $\mathcal{H}$ whenever $\mathcal{F}$ embeds into $\mathcal{H}$.

Our properties $P(w)$ will be such that if $P(\mathcal{H})$ holds, then P also holds for all substructures of $\mathcal{H}$. The definition then says that P holds for arbitrarily large elements of $\mathcal{C}(\tau)$ iff for any $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}(\tau)$ there is $\mathcal{F}' \in \mathcal{C}(\tau)$ isomorphic to $\mathcal{F}$ such that $P(\mathcal{F}')$ holds.

Observe also that if arbitrarily large structures in $\mathcal{C}(\tau)$ have one of finitely many properties, then one property holds for arbitrarily large elements of $\mathcal{C}(\tau)$.

Proposition 26. *Let $e : V \rightarrow V$ be a mapping on the random graph. Then e interpolates either the identity, e_E , e_N , a constant function, or $-$ modulo automorphisms.*

Proof. We show that arbitrarily large finite subgraphs of G have the property that e behaves on them like one of the operations of the proposition. Since there are finitely many operations to choose from, e then behaves like one fixed operation p from the list on arbitrarily large finite subgraphs of the random graph. By the homogeneity of the random graph, we can freely move finite graphs around by automorphisms, proving that e interpolates p .

So let $\mathcal{F}$ be any finite graph; we have to find a copy $\mathcal{F}'$ of $\mathcal{F}$ in G such that e behaves like one of the mentioned operations on this copy.

We color all pairs $\{x, y\}$ of distinct vertices of G

- by 1 if $e(x) = e(y)$,
- by 2 if $E(e(x), e(y))$,
- by 3 if $N(e(x), e(y))$.

By Corollary 16 there exists a copy $\mathcal{F}'$ of $\mathcal{F}$ in G such that all edges and all non-edges of $\mathcal{F}'$ have the same color χ_E and χ_N , respectively. If $(\chi_E, \chi_N) = (1, 1)$, then e behaves like the constant function on $\mathcal{F}'$. If $(\chi_E, \chi_N) = (2, 3)$, then it behaves like the identity, and if $(\chi_E, \chi_N) = (3, 2)$, then e behaves like $-$. If $(\chi_E, \chi_N) = (2, 2)$ or $(\chi_E, \chi_N) = (3, 3)$, then e behaves like e_E or e_N , respectively. Finally, it is easy to see that $(\chi_E, \chi_N) = (1, q)$ or $(\chi_E, \chi_N) = (q, 1)$, where $q \in \{2, 3\}$, is impossible if $\mathcal{F}$ contains the two three-element graphs with one and two edges, respectively. □

Definition 27. Let $\mathcal{U} = (U; F)$ be a graph, and let $f : U \rightarrow U$. Let S_1, S_2 be disjoint subsets of U . We say that f is *canonical on S_1* iff it behaves the same way on all edges and on all non-edges, respectively: This is to say that if f collapses one edge in S_1 , then it collapses all edges; if it makes an edge a non-edge, then it does so for all edges; etc. Similarly, we say that f is *canonical between S_1 and S_2* iff the same holds for all edges and non-edges between S_1 and S_2 .

We will often view $\mathcal{U}$ as a subgraph of the random graph, and f will be injective. In this situation, f is canonical on S_1 and between S_1, S_2 iff it behaves like the identity, $-$, e_E , or e_N on S_1 and between S_1, S_2 , respectively. Observe that what we really proved in Proposition 26 is that any $e : V \rightarrow V$ is canonical on arbitrarily large subgraphs of the random graph.

Definition 28. Let $\mathcal{U} = (U; F, U_1, \dots, U_n)$ be a partitioned graph, and let $f : U \rightarrow U$. We say that f is *canonical on $\mathcal{U}$* iff it is canonical on all U_i and between all distinct U_i, U_j . If $\mathcal{U} = (U; F, u_1, \dots, u_n)$ is an n -constant graph, and $f : U \rightarrow U$, then f is *canonical on $\mathcal{U}$* iff it is canonical on the corresponding $n + 2^n$ -partitioned graph.

Definition 29. We call a countable structure $\aleph_0$ -*universal* iff it embeds all finite structures of the same signature.

Lemma 30 (The n -partite graph interpolation lemma). *Let $\mathcal{U} = (U; C, U_1, \dots, U_n)$ be an $\aleph_0$ -universal partitioned graph, and let $f : U \rightarrow U$. Then every finite partitioned graph has a copy in $\mathcal{U}$ on which f is canonical.*

Proof. This is immediate from the n -partitioned graph Ramsey lemma (Lemma 20): Just like in the proof of Proposition 26, we color the edges and non-edges of $\mathcal{U}$ according to what f does to them. $\square$

Lemma 31 (The n -constant graph interpolation lemma). *Let $\mathcal{U} = (U; C, u_1, \dots, u_n)$ be an $\aleph_0$ -universal n -constant graph, and let $f : U \rightarrow U$. Then every finite n -constant graph has a copy in $\mathcal{U}$ on which f is canonical.*

Proof. This is immediate from the n -constant graph Ramsey lemma (Lemma 23). $\square$

7. UNARY FUNCTIONS

We now have the tools to settle the unary case: In this section, we will prove Theorem 1 which characterizes the unary minimal functions, Theorem 3 which lists the five closed supergroups of $\text{Aut}(G)$, and Theorem 4 which states that any closed monoid containing $\text{Aut}(G)$ either is generated by the group of its permutations, or contains e_E , e_N , or a constant function. We start by applying Lemma 31 to prove

Lemma 32. *Let $e : V \rightarrow V$ be so that it preserves N but not E . Then e generates e_N .*

Proof. We prove that for every finite subset F of V , e produces an operation which behaves like e_N on F . We first claim that there are adjacent vertices $a, b \in V$ such that $N(e(a), e(b))$. Since e does not preserve E , there exist u, v with $uv \in E$ such that $e(u)e(v) \notin E$. If $e(u)e(v) \in N$, then we are done. If $e(u) = e(v)$, then choose w such that $wu \in E$ and $wv \in N$. We have $e(w)e(u) = e(w)e(v) \in N$, so u, w prove the claim.

Now, $\mathcal{U} := (V; E, a, b)$ is an $\aleph_0$ -universal 2-constant graph. Therefore, by Lemma 31, e is canonical on arbitrarily large substructures of $\mathcal{U}$. Since e preserves N , it is easy to see that if e is canonical on a 2-constant graph which is large enough, then e must be injective. (For example, if e is canonical on a graph which contains the three-element graph with two edges, then e cannot collapse any edges of that graph.) Hence, e is canonical and injective on arbitrarily large 2-constant subgraphs of $\mathcal{U}$. Since e preserves N , we have that for arbitrarily large substructures of $\mathcal{U}$, it behaves like the identity or like e_N on and between the parts of these structures; in particular, it does not add any edges. Hence, for any finite 2-constant graph, we can delete the edge between the two constants without adding any other edges. But that means that starting from any finite graph, we can delete all edges by repeating this process, choosing any edge we want to get rid of in each step. This proves the lemma. $\square$

The following is just the dual statement.

Corollary 33. *Let $e : V \rightarrow V$ be so that it preserves E but not N . Then e generates e_E .*

Lemma 34. *Let $e : V \rightarrow V$ be so that it preserves neither E nor N . If e is not injective, then e generates a constant operation.*

Proof. We must show that for any finite subset F of V , e generates an operation which is constant on F .

Observe that e generates operations g, h which collapse an edge and a non-edge, respectively. To see this, note that since e is not injective, it collapses an edge or a non-edge; say without loss of generality it collapses an edge, so we can set $g := e$. If it also collapses a non-edge, then we are done. Otherwise, since e violates N , it sends some non-edge to an edge, which, with the help of an appropriate automorphism, can be collapsed by another application of e .

Having this, one proceeds inductively to collapse all the vertices of F , shifting F around with automorphisms accordingly and applying g and h . After at most $|F|$ steps, the whole of F is collapsed to a single vertex. $\square$

The following proposition already identifies the five minimal functions of Theorem 1.

Proposition 35. *Let Γ be a reduct of the random graph G . Then one of the following cases applies.*

- (1) Γ has a constant endomorphism.
- (2) Γ has e_E as an endomorphism.
- (3) Γ has e_N as an endomorphism.
- (4) Γ has $-$ as an automorphism.
- (5) Γ has sw as an automorphism.
- (6) All endomorphisms of Γ are generated by the automorphisms of G .

Proof. If Γ has an endomorphism e which preserves E but not N or N but not E , then we can refer to Lemma 32 and Corollary 33. If all of its endomorphisms preserve both N and E , then they are all generated by the automorphisms of G . We thus assume henceforth that Γ has an endomorphism e which violates both E and N .

If e is not injective, then it generates a constant operation, by Lemma 34. So suppose that e is injective. Fix distinct x, y such that $E(x, y)$ and $N(e(x), e(y))$.

By Proposition 26, e is canonical on arbitrarily large finite subgraphs of G . If e interpolates $-$, e_E , or e_N modulo automorphisms, then we are done. So assume this is not the case, i.e., there is a finite graph $\mathcal{F}_0$ with the property that on all copies of $\mathcal{F}_0$ in G , e does not behave like any of these operations. Observe that e then behaves like the identity on arbitrarily large subgraphs of G . Moreover, this assumption implies that if only a finite subgraph $\mathcal{F}$ of G is sufficiently large (i.e., if it embeds $\mathcal{F}_0$), and e is canonical on $\mathcal{F}$, then e behaves like the identity on $\mathcal{F}$.

We now make a series of observations which rule out bad behavior of e between subsets of the random graph, and which follow from our assumptions of the preceding paragraph; the easily verifiable details are left to the reader.

- If e behaves like $-$ between the parts of arbitrarily large finite 2-partitioned subgraphs of G , then it generates sw .
- If e behaves like e_N between the parts of arbitrarily large finite 2-partitioned subgraphs of G , then it generates e_N .

- If e behaves like e_E between the parts of arbitrarily large finite 2-partitioned subgraphs of G , then it generates e_E .

We assume therefore that for sufficiently large finite 2-partitioned subgraphs of G , if e is canonical on such a graph, then e behaves like the identity on and between the parts.

Now observe that $\mathcal{Q} := (V; E, x, y)$ is an $\aleph_0$ -universal 2-constant graph. Let $\mathcal{F} = (F; D, f_1, f_2)$ be any finite 2-constant graph. By the n -constant interpolation lemma (Lemma 31), there is a copy $\mathcal{F}'$ of $\mathcal{F}$ in $\mathcal{Q}$ on which e is canonical. By our assumption above, if only $\mathcal{F}$ is large enough, then being canonical on a proper part F'_i of the 6-partitioned graph $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}' = (F'; E, \{x\}, \{y\}, F'_1, \dots, F'_4)$ corresponding to $\mathcal{F}'$ means behaving like the identity thereon, and being canonical between proper parts means behaving like the identity between these parts. Therefore, all 2-constant graphs $\mathcal{F}$ have a copy $\mathcal{F}' = (F'; E, x, y)$ in $\mathcal{Q}$ such that e behaves like the identity on and between all of the parts F'_i, F'_j of the corresponding partitioned graph $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}' = (F'; E, \{x\}, \{y\}, F'_1, \dots, F'_4)$.

Of a two-constant graph $\mathcal{F}$, consider the reduct $\mathcal{H} = (F; D, f_1)$. This reduct has a copy $\mathcal{H}'$ in $\mathcal{Q}^x = (V; E, x)$ on which e is canonical. The corresponding partitioned graph has two parts H'_1, H'_2 , and x is connected to, say, all vertices in H'_1 and to none in H'_2 . Since e is canonical on $\mathcal{H}'$, either all edges leading to H'_1 are kept or deleted. Similarly with the non-edges between x and H'_2 . If all edges are deleted and all non-edges kept for arbitrarily large $\mathcal{H}$, then e generates e_N . If all edges are deleted and all non-edges edged for arbitrarily large $\mathcal{H}$, then e interpolates sw modulo automorphisms. If all edges are kept and all non-edges edged for arbitrarily large $\mathcal{H}$, then e generates e_E . So we assume that if only $\mathcal{H}$ is large enough, then all edges and non-edges are kept by e on those copies of $\mathcal{H}$ on which e is canonical.

We use the same argument with the reduct $(F; D, f_2)$ and $\mathcal{Q}^y = (V; E, y)$, and arrive at the conclusion that if the two-constant graph $\mathcal{F}$ is large enough, then on every copy of $\mathcal{F}$ in $\mathcal{Q}$ which e is canonical on, the edges and non-edges leading from x and y to the other vertices of the copy are kept.

Combining this with what we have established before, we conclude that if only $\mathcal{F}$ is large enough, and $\mathcal{F}'$ is a copy of $\mathcal{F}$ in $\mathcal{Q}$ which e is canonical on, then e behaves like the identity on $\mathcal{F}'$ except between x and y , where it deletes the edge. Hence, for any finite $\mathcal{F}$ we can find a copy in $\mathcal{Q}$ on which e behaves that way. But this implies that starting from any finite graph $\mathcal{S} := (F; D)$, we can pick any edge in $\mathcal{S}$, say between vertices f_1, f_2 , and then find a copy of $\mathcal{F} := (F; D, f_1, f_2)$ in $\mathcal{Q}$ such that e deletes exactly that edge from the copy without changing the rest. Hence, by shifting finite graphs around with automorphisms, we can delete a single edge from an arbitrary finite subgraph of G without changing the rest of the graph. Applying this successively, we can remove all edges from arbitrary finite graphs, proving that e generates e_N . $\square$

Now Theorem 1 follows: Let f be a minimal function. Let $\mathcal{M}$ the monoid it generates, and let Γ be the reduct which has $\mathcal{M}$ as its endomorphism monoid. We apply the previous theorem to Γ . Observe that Case (6) of that theorem cannot hold for Γ , since its endomorphism f is non-trivial, and hence not generated by the automorphisms of G . Thus, Γ contains one of the functions of the other cases, meaning that f is equivalent to one of those functions. This finishes the proof.

Proving Theorem 4 amounts to showing that if cases (1),(2),(3), and (6) of Proposition 35 do not apply for a structure Γ , and hence if (4) or (5) of that proposition hold, then its endomorphisms are generated by its automorphisms. This will be accomplished in the three propositions to come.

Proposition 36. *Let Γ be a reduct of the random graph, and suppose Γ is preserved by $-$ but not by e_N, e_E , or a constant operation. Then the endomorphisms of Γ are generated by $\{-\} \cup \text{Aut}(G)$, or Γ is preserved by sw .*

Proof. Suppose the endomorphisms of Γ are not generated by $\{-\} \cup \text{Aut}(G)$. Then, by Proposition 7, there is a relation R invariant under $\{-\} \cup \text{Aut}(G)$ and an endomorphism e of Γ which violates R ; that is, there exists a tuple $a := (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in R$ such that $e(a) = (e(a_1), \dots, e(a_n)) \notin R$.

Since R is definable in the random graph, e violates either an edge or a non-edge. Hence, as in the proof of Proposition 35, the assumption that e does not generate e_N, e_E , or a constant operation implies that e is injective.

Let $\mathcal{F} = (F; D, f_1, \dots, f_n)$ be any finite n -constant graph. By the n -constant interpolation lemma (Lemma 31), there is a copy $\mathcal{F}'$ of $\mathcal{F}$ in the $\aleph_0$ -universal n -constant graph $\mathcal{Q} := (V; E, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ such that e is canonical on this copy.

We now make a series of observations on the behavior of e on and between subsets of V where it is canonical.

- Since by assumption, e does not interpolate e_E, e_N , or a constant operation modulo automorphisms, it behaves like $-$ or the identity on sufficiently large finite subgraphs of G where it is canonical.
- Suppose that for arbitrarily large finite 2-partitioned subgraphs of G , e behaves like the identity on the parts and like $-$ between the parts. Then e generates sw .
- Suppose that for arbitrarily large finite 2-partitioned subgraphs of G , e behaves like the identity on the parts and like e_N (like e_E) between the parts. Then e generates e_N (e_E).
- Suppose that for arbitrarily large finite 2-partitioned subgraphs of G , e behaves like $-$ on the parts and like the identity $/ e_N / e_E$ between the parts. Then e and $-$ together generate $sw / e_E / e_N$. This is because we can apply the preceding two observations to $-e$.
- Suppose that for arbitrarily large finite 2-partitioned subgraphs of G which e is canonical on, e behaves like $-$ on one part and like the identity on the other part. Then e and $-$ together generate e_N .

To see the last assertion for the case where e behaves like the identity between the parts, select an edge within one of the parts that is mapped to a non-edge. For arbitrary finite $A \subseteq V$ we can now use the operation e to get rid of one edge in the graph induced by A in G and preserve all other edges, and so eventually generate an operation that behaves like e_N on A . For the case where e behaves like $-$ between the parts, we can apply the same argument to $-e$. If e behaves like e_N between the parts, then we can all the more delete edges. If it behaves like e_E between the parts, then $-e$ behaves like e_N and we are back in the preceding case.

Summarizing our observations, we can assume that for an arbitrary finite n -constant graph $\mathcal{F}$ there is a copy of $\mathcal{F}$ in $\mathcal{Q}$ such that e behaves like the identity on and between all proper parts F'_i, F'_j of the corresponding partitioned graph, or like $-$ on and between all of its parts. If only the second case holds for arbitrarily large n -constant graphs $\mathcal{F}$, then we simply proceed our argument with $-e$ instead of e . We can do that since also $-e(a) \notin R$: For otherwise, picking an automorphism α of G such that $\alpha(-(-x)) = x$ for all $x \in V$, we would have $\alpha(-(-e(a))) = e(a) \in R$, contrary to our choice of a . Thus we assume that for arbitrary

finite n -constant graphs $\mathcal{F}$ there is a copy of $\mathcal{F}$ in $\mathcal{Q}$ such that e behaves like the identity on and between all proper parts of that copy.

As in the proof of Proposition 35, we may assume that if a copy $\mathcal{F}' = (F'; E, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ of $\mathcal{F}$ in $\mathcal{Q}$ is large enough and e is canonical on $\mathcal{F}'$ and behaves like the identity on and between all proper parts F'_i, F'_j of the corresponding n -partitioned graph $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}'$, then it leaves the edges and non-edges between the a_i and the vertices in $F' \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ unaltered. It follows that for arbitrary finite n -constant graphs $\mathcal{F}$ there is a copy of $\mathcal{F}$ in $\mathcal{Q}$ such that the only edges or non-edges changed by e on this copy are those between the a_i .

Finally, note that since R is definable in the random graph and $e(a) \notin R$, e destroys at least one edge or one non-edge on $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$. Without loss of generality, say that a_1, a_2 are adjacent but their values under e are not. We have shown that for arbitrarily large 2-constant graphs $\mathcal{H}$, there is a copy of $\mathcal{H}$ in $(V; E, a_1, a_2)$ such that e behaves like the identity on this copy, except for the edge between a_1 and a_2 , which is destroyed. This clearly implies that e generates e_N . $\square$

Proposition 37. *Let Γ be a reduct of random graph, and suppose Γ is preserved by sw but not by e_N, e_E , or a constant operation. Then the endomorphisms of Γ are generated by $\{sw\} \cup \text{Aut}(G)$, or Γ is preserved by $-$.*

Proof. The proof is very similar to the proof of the preceding proposition. This time we know that unless the endomorphisms are generated by $\{sw\} \cup \text{Aut}(G)$, there exists an endomorphism e that violates a relation R which is preserved by $\{sw\} \cup \text{Aut}(G)$. Fix a tuple a as before.

As in the preceding proof, we may assume that e is injective. If e interpolates $-$ modulo automorphisms, we are done. Suppose therefore that if e is canonical on a finite partitioned graph large enough, then it must behave like the identity on its parts.

If e behaves like e_N (e_E) between the parts of arbitrarily large finite 2-partitioned subgraphs of G , then it generates e_N (e_E). Thus we may assume that it behaves like the identity or $-$ between such parts.

Suppose that for arbitrarily large finite 3-partitioned subgraphs $\mathcal{F} = (F; E, F_1, F_2, F_3)$ of G which e is canonical on, e behaves like the $-$ between exactly two of the parts, say between F_1, F_2 , and like the identity between F_2, F_3 and F_1, F_3 . Then e is easily seen to generate both e_N and e_E . Indeed, if we want to delete¹ any edge from a finite graph, then we can view the vertices of the edge as two parts of a 3-partitioned graph, where the third part contains all the other vertices. If e behaves like $-$ between the two vertices whose edge we want to delete, and like the identity on and between the other parts, what happens is exactly that the edge is deleted.

If for arbitrarily large finite 3-partitioned subgraphs $\mathcal{F}$ of G which e is canonical on, e behaves like $-$ between, say, F_1, F_2 and F_1, F_3 , and like the identity between F_2, F_3 , then by applying a suitable switch operation i_A to e we are back in the preceding case. Note here that there is an automorphism α of G such that $i_A(\alpha(i_A(x))) = x$ for all $x \in V$. Therefore, $i_A(e(a)) \notin R$; for otherwise, we would have $i_A(\alpha(i_A(e(a)))) = e(a) \in R$, a contradiction.

The latter argument works also if e behaves like $-$ between all three parts. Summarizing, we may assume that if e is canonical on a finite n -partitioned graph which is large enough, where $n \geq 3$, then it behaves like the identity on and between all of the parts.

¹For the purposes of the proof, we identify ourselves with the personalized endomorphism monoid.

As for n -constant graphs which e is canonical on, e might flip edges and non-edges between some parts and the constants. However, this situation can easily be repaired by a single application of sw .

Finally, observe that at least one edge or one non-edge on $a_1, \dots, a_n$ is destroyed, and that we therefore can generate either e_N or e_E . $\square$

Proposition 38. *Let Γ be a reduct of the random graph, and suppose Γ is preserved by sw and by $-$, but not by e_N, e_E , or a constant operation. Then the endomorphisms of Γ are generated by $\{-, sw\} \cup \text{Aut}(G)$, or Γ is preserved by all permutations.*

Proof. The argument goes as in the preceding two propositions; we leave the details to the reader. $\square$

Theorem 4 now is a direct consequence of Proposition 35, and Propositions 36, 37, 38: If a reduct Γ of G does not have e_E, e_N , or a constant operation as an endomorphism, and if its endomorphisms are not generated by the automorphisms of G , then Proposition 35 implies that it has either $-$ or sw as an endomorphism. Since $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ contains $\text{Aut}(G)$, once Γ has $-$ or sw as an endomorphism, it also has its inverse as an endomorphism; thus it has $-$ or sw as an automorphism. But then by the preceding three propositions, either $\text{End}(\Gamma)$ is generated by $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$, or Γ is preserved by all permutations. The latter case, however, is impossible, as this would imply that e_E and e_N are among its endomorphisms, which we excluded already.

Observe also how Thomas' classification of closed permutation groups containing $\text{Aut}(G)$ (Theorem 3) follows from our results: If a group properly contains $\text{Aut}(G)$, then it contains $-$ or sw , by Proposition 35. If it contains $-$ but is not generated by $-$, then it contains sw by Proposition 36. Similarly, if it contains sw but is not generated by sw , then it contains $-$ by Proposition 37. If it contains both $-$ and sw , but is not generated by these operations, then it must already contain all permutations (Proposition 38).

8. PRODUCING BINARY INJECTIONS

Having found the minimal unary operations, we now turn to operations of higher arity. The goal of this section is proving Theorem 40, which (together with Lemma 41) implies that all minimal functions are at most binary.

Definition 39. We say that an operation $f : V^k \rightarrow V$ is *essentially unary* iff there exists a unary function $g : V \rightarrow V$ and $1 \leq i \leq k$ such that $f(x_1, \dots, x_k) = g(x_i)$ for all $x_1, \dots, x_k \in V$. If f is not essentially unary, we call it *essential*.

Theorem 40. *Let f be an essential operation on the random graph that preserves E and N . Then f generates a binary injection.*

The following lemma says that minimal essential operations always preserve E and N ; thus, by the preceding theorem, all such operations are binary.

Lemma 41. *Minimal essential operations on the random graph must preserve E and N .*

Proof. Suppose an essential function $f : V^n \rightarrow V$ does not preserve E (the argument for N is analogous). Then there exist tuples $(x_1, \dots, x_n), (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ such that $E(x_i, y_i)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and such that $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $f(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ are not connected by an edge. Fix $u, v \in V$ such that $E(u, v)$ holds, and choose automorphisms α_i such that $\alpha_i(u) = x_i$ and $\alpha_i(v) = y_i$, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. The function $g(x) := f(\alpha_1(x), \dots, \alpha_n(x))$ is unary and violates

E ; hence it is non-trivial. But being unary, it cannot generate the essential function f , proving that f is not minimal. $\square$

The following lemma allows us to work with binary operations; its proof is very similar to the proof of a corresponding lemma in [6].

Lemma 42. *Let $f : V^k \rightarrow V$ be an essential operation. Then f generates a binary essential operation.*

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that f depends all its arguments and is at least ternary. In particular, there are $a_1, \dots, a_k$ and a'_1 such that $f(a_1, \dots, a_k) \neq f(a'_1, a_2, \dots, a_k)$. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1. There are $b_1, \dots, b_k$ such that $E(b_i, a_i)$ for $2 \leq i \leq k$ and $f(b_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \neq f(b_1, \dots, b_k)$. By the homogeneity of G we can find automorphisms $\alpha_3, \dots, \alpha_k$ such that $\alpha_i(a_2) = a_i$ and $\alpha_i(b_2) = b_i$. Using these automorphisms we define

$$g(x, y) := f(x, y, \alpha_3(y), \dots, \alpha_k(y)),$$

which clearly depends on both arguments.

Case 2. For all $b_1, \dots, b_k$, if $E(a_i, b_i)$ for $2 \leq i \leq k$, then $f(b_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) = f(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k)$. Since f depends on its second coordinate, there are $c_1, \dots, c_k$ and c'_2 such that

$$f(c_1, c_2, c_3, \dots, c_k) \neq f(c_1, c'_2, c_3, \dots, c_k).$$

Then $f(c_1, a_2, \dots, a_k)$ can be equal to either $f(c_1, c_2, c_3, \dots, c_k)$, or to $f(c_1, c'_2, c_3, \dots, c_k)$, but not to both. We assume without loss of generality that $f(c_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \neq f(c_1, c_2, c_3, \dots, c_k)$. From the extension property of the random graph we see that we can choose $d_2, \dots, d_k$ such that $E(d_i, a_i)$ and $E(d_i, c_i)$ for $2 \leq i \leq k$. Since G is homogeneous there are automorphisms $\alpha_3, \dots, \alpha_k$ of G such that $\alpha_i(c_2) = c_i$ and $\alpha_i(d_2) = d_i$. We claim that the operation g defined by

$$g(x, y) := f(x, y, \alpha_3(y), \dots, \alpha_k(y))$$

depends on both arguments. Indeed, we know that $g(a_1, d_2) = f(a_1, d_2, \dots, d_k) = f(a_1, \dots, a_k)$, and that $f(a'_1, d_2) = f(a'_1, d_2, \dots, d_k) = f(a'_1, a_2, \dots, a_k)$. By the choice of the values $a_1, \dots, a_k$ and a'_1 these two values are distinct, and we have that g depends on the first argument. For the second argument, note that $g(c_1, d_2) = f(c_1, d_2, \dots, d_k) = f(c_1, a_2, \dots, a_k)$ and that $g(c_1, c_2) = f(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k)$. Because $f(c_1, a_2, \dots, a_k)$ and $f(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k)$ are distinct, we have that g also depends on the second argument. $\square$

We are left with the task of producing a binary injection from a binary essential function preserving E and N . This will be prepared in the general Lemma 44.

Definition 43. A relation $R \subseteq X^k$ is called *intersection-closed* iff for all $(u_1, \dots, u_k), (v_1, \dots, v_k) \in R$ there is a tuple $(w_1, \dots, w_k) \in R$ such that for all $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ we have $w_i \neq w_j$ whenever $u_i \neq u_j$ or $v_i \neq v_j$.

Lemma 44. *Let Γ be an ω -categorical structure where $\neq$ is primitive positive definable. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) *If ϕ is a primitive positive formula such that both $\phi \wedge x \neq y$ and $\phi \wedge u \neq v$ are satisfiable over Γ , then $\phi \wedge x \neq y \wedge u \neq v$ is satisfiable over Γ as well.*
- (2) *Every finite induced substructure of Γ^2 admits an injective homomorphism into Γ .*
- (3) *Γ is preserved by a binary injective operation.*
- (4) *All primitive positive definable relations in Γ are intersection-closed.*

We would like to remark that the first item in Lemma 44 is inspired from joint work of the alphabetically first author with Peter Jonsson and Timo von Oertzen in [5].

Proof. Throughout the proof, let $e_1, e_2, \dots$ be an enumeration of the domain D of Γ . If f is a binary injective polymorphism of Γ , then clearly every relation in Γ is intersection-closed, so (3) implies (4). The implication from (4) to (1) is straightforward as well.

We now show the implication from (1) to (2). Let S be a finite induced substructure of Γ^2 . Without loss of generality we can assume that S is induced in Γ by a set of the form $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}^2$, for sufficiently large n . Consider the formula ϕ whose variables $x_1, \dots, x_{n^2}$ are the elements of S ,

$$x_1 := (e_1, e_1), \dots, x_n := (e_1, e_n), \dots, x_{n^2-n+1} := (e_n, e_1), \dots, x_{n^2} := (e_n, e_n),$$

and which is the conjunction over all literals $R((e_{i_1}, e_{j_1}), \dots, (e_{i_k}, e_{j_k}))$ such that $R(e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_k})$ and $R(e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_k})$ hold in Γ . So ϕ states precisely which relations hold in S .

Using induction over the number of inequalities, we will now show that for any conjunction $\sigma := \bigwedge_{1 \leq k \leq m} x_{i_k} \neq x_{j_k}$ with the property that $i_k \neq j_k$ for all $1 \leq k \leq m$, the formula $\phi \wedge \sigma$ is satisfiable over Γ . This implies that there exists an n^2 -tuple t in Γ with pairwise distinct entries which satisfies ϕ ; the assignment that sends every $x_i \in S$ to t_i is an injective homomorphism from S into Γ .

For the induction beginning, let $x_i \neq x_j$ be any inequality. Let r, s be the n^2 -tuples defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} r &:= (e_1, \dots, e_1, e_2, \dots, e_2, \dots, e_n, \dots, e_n) \\ s &:= (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n, e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n, \dots, e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n). \end{aligned}$$

These two tuples satisfy ϕ , because the projections to the first and second coordinate, respectively, are homomorphisms from S to Γ . Now either r or s satisfies $x_i \neq x_j$, proving that $\phi \wedge x_i \neq x_j$ is satisfiable in Γ .

In the induction step, let a conjunction $\sigma := \bigwedge_{1 \leq k \leq m} x_{i_k} \neq x_{j_k}$ be given, where $m \geq 2$. Set $\sigma' := \bigwedge_{3 \leq k \leq m} x_{i_k} \neq x_{j_k}$, and $\phi' := \phi \wedge \sigma'$. Observe that ϕ' has a primitive positive definition in Γ , as ϕ and $\neq$ have such definitions. By induction hypothesis, both $\phi' \wedge x_{i_1} \neq x_{j_1}$ and $\phi' \wedge x_{i_2} \neq x_{j_2}$ are satisfiable in Γ . But then $\phi' \wedge x_{i_1} \neq x_{j_1} \wedge x_{i_2} \neq x_{j_2} = \phi \wedge \sigma$ is satisfiable over Γ as well by (1), concluding the proof.

The implication from (2) to (3) is by a standard application of König's lemma. This is because the fact that Γ is ω -categorical implies that for every $n \geq 1$, there are only finitely many "behaviors" of functions from $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}^2$ to Γ , by the theorem of Ryll-Nardzewski.

We give the standard argument for completeness. We say that two homomorphisms f_1, f_2 from the structure induced by a set $\{e_1, \dots, e_l\}^2$ in Γ to Γ are *equivalent* if there is an automorphism h of Γ such that $h(f_1(x, y)) = f_2(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in \{e_1, \dots, e_l\}$. Consider the infinite tree T whose vertices are the equivalence classes of injective homomorphisms from structures induced by a set of the form $\{e_1, \dots, e_l\}^2$ to Γ . There is an arc from one equivalence class of injective homomorphisms to another in T iff there are representatives f_1 and f_2 of the two classes such that the domain of f_1 is $\{e_1, \dots, e_l\}^2$, and the domain of f_2 is $\{e_1, \dots, e_l, e_{l+1}\}^2$, and f_2 is an extension of f_1 .

The theorem of Ryll-Nardzewski implies that every node in T has a finite number of outgoing arcs, since there are only finitely many inequivalent homomorphisms from a set $\{e_1, \dots, e_l\}^2$ to Γ . Since T is infinite by (2), König's lemma asserts the existence of an infinite branch B in T . This infinite branch gives rise to an injective binary polymorphism f of Γ ,

which is defined inductively as follows. The restriction of f to $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ will be an element from the n -th node of B . To start the induction, pick any function f_1 from the first node of B ; f_1 has domain $\{e_1\}^2$. Set f to equal f_1 on $\{e_1\}^2$. Suppose f is already defined on $e_1, \dots, e_n$, for $n \geq 1$. By definition of T , we find representatives f_n and f_{n+1} of the n -th and the $n+1$ -st element of B such that f_n is a restriction of f_{n+1} . The inductive assumption gives us an automorphism h of Γ such that $h(f_n(x, y)) = f(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$. We set $f(x, y)$ to be $h(f_{n+1}(x, y))$, for all $x, y \in \{e_1, \dots, e_{n+1}\}$. The restriction of f to $e_1, \dots, e_{n+1}$ will therefore be a member of the $n+1$ -st node of B . The operation f defined in this way is indeed an injective homomorphism from Γ^2 to Γ , and we are done. $\square$

We are now ready to end this section and provide a proof of Theorem 40.

Proof of Theorem 40. Let an essential operation $f : V^k \rightarrow V$ preserving E and N be given. By Lemma 42, f generates a binary essential function; clearly, this function still preserves E and N , so that we may henceforth assume that f is itself binary.

Consider the structure Δ whose relations are the relations that are first-order definable in G and preserved by f . In order to prove that f generates a binary injection, we will refer to Proposition 7 and prove that there is a binary injection preserving Δ .

By its definition, Δ has E and N amongst its relations. We claim that $\neq$ is also among the relations of Δ : This is because $x \neq y$ iff $\exists z. E(x, z) \wedge N(y, z)$, so $\neq$ has a primitive positive definition from E and N , and hence from Δ . Hence, we may apply Lemma 44 to Δ , and in order to show that Δ is preserved by a binary injection, it suffices to show that if ϕ is a primitive positive formula over Δ such that both $\phi \wedge x \neq y$ and $\phi \wedge s \neq t$ are satisfiable over Δ , then $\phi \wedge x \neq y \wedge s \neq t$ is satisfiable over Δ as well.

To this end, let ϕ be a primitive positive formula over the signature of Δ such that

- there is a tuple t_1 that satisfies $\phi \wedge x \neq y$
- there is a tuple t_2 that satisfies $\phi \wedge s \neq t$.

Let a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 and b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4 be the values for x, y, s, t in t_1 and t_2 , respectively. We have $a_1 \neq a_2$ and $b_3 \neq b_4$. We want to show that $\phi \wedge x \neq y \wedge s \neq t$ is satisfiable over Δ . Thus, if $a_3 \neq a_4$ or $b_1 \neq b_2$, there is nothing to show, and so we assume that $a_3 = a_4$ and $b_1 = b_2$.

We claim that there are automorphisms α, β of G such that in the tuple $t_3 := f(\alpha(t_1), \beta(t_2))$ the value of x is different from the value of y , and the value of s is different from the value of t . Then, since f preserves Δ , the tuple t_3 shows that $\phi \wedge x \neq y \wedge s \neq t$ is satisfiable over Δ , and concludes the proof.

To prove the claim, we will find tuples $c := (c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4)$ and $d := (d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$ of the same type as (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) and (b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) , respectively, such that the tuple $e := f(c, d)$ satisfies $e_1 \neq e_2$ and $e_3 \neq e_4$. Then, by the homogeneity of G , we can find automorphisms α and β of G sending a to c and b to d , which suffices for the prove of our claim.

In the sequel, we will assume that $X(a_1, a_2)$ and $Y(b_3, b_4)$, where $X, Y \in \{E, N\}$.

Case 1. Suppose first that $a_3 = a_4 \in \{a_1, a_2\}$ and $b_1 = b_2 \in \{b_3, b_4\}$; wlog $a_3 = a_2$ and $b_1 = b_3$.

Case 1.1 There exists $u \in V$ such that for all $p, v \in V$ with $uv \in Y$ we have $f(p, u) = f(p, v)$. Then, because f preserves $\neq$, we have $f(p, u) \neq f(q, u)$ for all $p \neq q$. Since f is essential there are $p, v \in V$ such that $f(p, u) \neq f(p, v)$. Pick $w \in V$ such that $wu, wv \in Y$. Pick moreover $q \in V$ such that $pq \in X$. We have $f(p, v) \neq f(p, u) = f(p, w)$. Moreover,

$f(p, w) = f(p, u) \neq f(q, u) = f(q, w)$. Hence, the tuples $c := (q, p, p, p)$ and $d := (w, w, w, v)$ prove the claim.

Case 1.2 For all $u \in V$ there exist $p, v \in V$ with $uv \in Y$ such that $f(p, u) \neq f(p, v)$. Pick $m, n, u \in V$ with $mn \in X$ and $f(m, u) \neq f(n, u)$. Pick $p, v \in V$ such that $uv \in Y$ and $f(p, u) \neq f(p, v)$. If we can pick p in such a way that $pm, pn \in X$, then since either $f(m, u) \neq f(p, u)$ or $f(n, u) \neq f(p, u)$ we have that either (m, p, p, p) or (n, p, p, p) proves the claim together with the tuple (u, u, u, v) . So suppose that this is impossible. Then for any $q \in V$ with $qm, qn \in X$ we have $f(q, u) = f(q, v) \neq f(p, u)$, so we have that (q, p, p, p) and (u, u, u, v) satisfy the claim.

Case 2. Now suppose that $a_3 = a_4 \in \{a_1, a_2\}$ and $b_1 = b_2 \notin \{b_3, b_4\}$; wlog $a_3 = a_2$. Write $b_1b_3 \in Q_3$ and $b_1b_4 \in Q_4$, where $Q_3, Q_4 \in \{E, N\}$.

Case 2.1 There exists $u \in V$ such that for all p, v, r with $vr \in Y$, $uv \in Q_3$ and $ur \in Q_4$ we have $f(p, v) = f(p, r)$. Then one easily concludes that for all $p \in V$ and all $v, v' \in V$ with $v, v' \neq u$ we have $f(p, v) = f(p, v')$. This implies that $f(p, v) \neq f(q, v)$ whenever $p \neq q$ and $v \neq u$. Since f is essential, there exist $p, v \in V$ with $uv \in Y$ such that $f(p, u) \neq f(p, v)$. Now pick $w, q \in V$ such that $wu \in Q_3$, $wv \in Q_4$, and $qp \in X$. Then $f(p, w) \neq f(q, w)$, and so the tuples (q, p, p, p) and (w, w, u, v) prove the claim.

Case 2.2 For all u there exist p, v, r with $vr \in Y$, $uv \in Q_3$, $ur \in Q_4$ and $f(p, v) \neq f(p, r)$. Pick m, n, u with $mn \in X$ and $f(m, u) \neq f(n, u)$. Pick $p, v, r \in V$ such that $vr \in Y$, $uv \in Q_3$, $ur \in Q_4$ and $f(p, v) \neq f(p, r)$. If we can pick p in such a way that $pm, pn \in X$, then either (m, p, p, p) and (u, u, v, r) or (n, p, p, p) and (u, u, v, r) prove the claim. So suppose that this is impossible. Then for any q with $qm, qn \in X$ and all $v, r \in V$ with $vr \in Y$, $uv \in Q_3$, $ur \in Q_4$ we have $f(q, v) = f(q, r)$. This implies that for all such q and all $v, v' \neq u$ we have $f(q, v) = f(q, v')$. Pick w such that $wv \in Q_3$, $wr \in Q_4$. Pick q such that $qp \in X$. We have $f(q, w) \neq f(p, w)$, and so (q, p, p, p) and (w, w, v, r) prove the claim.

Case 3. To finish the proof, suppose that $a_3 = a_4 \notin \{a_1, a_2\}$ and $b_1 = b_2 \notin \{b_3, b_4\}$. Write $a_3a_1 \in P_1$, $a_3a_2 \in P_2$, $b_1b_3 \in Q_3$ and $b_1b_4 \in Q_4$, where $P_i, Q_i \in \{E, N\}$.

Case 3.1 There exists u such that for all p, v, r with $vr \in Y$, $uv \in Q_3$ and $ur \in Q_4$ we have $f(p, v) = f(p, r)$. Then one easily concludes that for all $p \in V$ and all $v, v' \in V$ with $v, v' \neq u$ we have $f(p, v) = f(p, v')$. This implies that $f(p, v) \neq f(q, v)$ whenever $p \neq q$ and $v \neq u$. Since f is essential, there exist p, v with $uv \in Y$ such that $f(p, u) \neq f(p, v)$. Now pick w, m, n such that $wu \in Q_3$, $wv \in Q_4$, $mn \in X$, $mp \in P_1$, and $np \in P_2$. Then the tuples (m, n, p, p) and (w, w, u, v) prove the claim.

Case 3.2 For all u there exist p, v, r with $vr \in Y$, $uv \in Q_3$, $ur \in Q_4$ and $f(p, v) \neq f(p, r)$. Pick m, n, u with $mn \in X$ and $f(m, u) \neq f(n, u)$. Pick p, v, r such that $vr \in Y$, $uv \in Q_3$, $ur \in Q_4$ and $f(p, v) \neq f(p, r)$. If we can pick p in such a way that $pm \in P_1$ and $pn \in P_2$, then (m, n, p, p) and (u, u, v, r) prove the claim, so suppose that this is impossible. Then for any q with $qm \in P_1$ and $qn \in P_2$ and all v, r with $vr \in Y$, $uv \in Q_3$, $ur \in Q_4$ we have $f(q, v) = f(q, r)$. This is easily seen to imply that for all such q and all $v, v' \neq u$ we have $f(q, v) = f(q, v')$. Pick w such that $wv \in Q_3$, $wr \in Q_4$, and $w \neq u$. Pick q, q' such that $qq' \in X$, $qp \in P_1$ and $q'p \in P_2$. We have $f(q, w) \neq f(q', w)$, and thus. Then (q, q', p, p) and (w, w, v, r) prove the claim. $\square$

9. THE ORDERED GRAPH PRODUCT RAMSEY LEMMA

In order to find the minimal functions which are not unary, we need to develop the Ramsey-theoretic tools that allow us to find patterns in the behavior of such higher arity functions; this is the purpose of this section.

Definition 45. Let Γ be a structure and $a^1, \dots, a^m \in \Gamma$. We write $\text{Type}(a^1, \dots, a^m)$ for the set of quantifier-free formulas satisfied by the tuple $(a^1, \dots, a^m)$ in Γ , and refer to this set as the *type* of $(a^1, \dots, a^m)$ in Γ .

Definition 46. Let $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_n$ be structures. For a tuple x in the cartesian product $\Gamma := \Gamma_1 \times \dots \times \Gamma_n$, we write x_i for the i -th coordinate of x . The *type* of a sequence of tuples $a^1, \dots, a^m \in \Gamma$, denoted by $\text{Type}(a^1, \dots, a^m)$, is the cartesian product of the types of $(a_i^1, \dots, a_i^m)$ in Γ_i .

Definition 47. A *graph product* is a finite product of graphs. An *ordered graph* is a graph with an additional total order $\prec$ on the vertices. An *ordered graph product* is a cartesian product of ordered graphs.

The following extends the definition of a canonical function on a graph from Section 6 to functions on (ordered) graph products.

Definition 48. Let $F_1, \dots, F_n, Z$ be (ordered) graphs. Set $F := F_1 \times \dots \times F_n$. An operation $g : F \rightarrow Z$ is *canonical* iff for all $x, y, u, v \in F$ with $\text{Type}(x, y) = \text{Type}(u, v)$ we have $\text{Type}(f(x), f(y)) = \text{Type}(f(u), f(v))$.

We remark that the reason for us to define “canonical” in terms of sequences of length 2 is that ordered graphs only have binary relations; for arbitrary structures, one would have to consider arbitrary finite sequences.

Lemma 49 (The ordered graph product Ramsey lemma). *For every finite ordered graph product $F := F_1 \times \dots \times F_n$ there exists a finite ordered graph product $H := H_1 \times \dots \times H_n$ such that for all functions $f : H \rightarrow Z$ to an ordered graph Z there is a copy F' of F in H on which f is canonical.*

Note that Lemma 49 is not true if the graphs are not ordered: Let $n = 2$, and let I_2 be the graph which has two vertices and no edges. Set F_1 and F_2 equal to I_2 . Suppose H exists, and order its components H_1, H_2 linearly. Define on the domain of H the following graph Z : Two pairs x, y are connected by an edge iff they are comparable in the product order. Set $f : H \rightarrow Z$ to be the identity function. Now whenever $x_i, y_i \in H_i$ are so that they induce copies F'_i of F_i , for $i = 1, 2$, then f is not canonical on $F'_1 \times F'_2$: for, assume wlog that x_i is smaller than y_i in the order on H_i . Then $\text{Type}((x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2)) = \text{Type}((x_1, y_2), (y_1, x_2))$, but $\text{Type}(f(x_1, x_2), f(y_1, y_2)) \neq \text{Type}(f(x_1, y_2), f(y_1, x_2))$ as $f(x_1, x_2), f(y_1, y_2)$ are connected by an edge in Z but $f(x_1, y_2), f(y_1, x_2)$ are not.

We remark that as we have seen in Section 6, $n > 1$ is necessary for this problem to appear.

Proof of Lemma 49. We prove the following claim: For every type $\text{Type}(u, v)$ of n -tuples u, v in the ordered graph product F there exists a finite ordered graph product $H := H_1 \times \dots \times H_n$ such that whenever $f : H \rightarrow Z$ is a function, then there is a copy F' of F in H with the property that $\text{Type}(f(x), f(y)) = \text{Type}(f(a), f(b))$ for all $x, y, a, b \in F'$ such that $\text{Type}(x, y) = \text{Type}(a, b) = \text{Type}(u, v)$. Repeated use of the claim for all types of pairs in F then proves the lemma.

In fact, we prove the following more abstract statement, which clearly implies our original claim: For every type $\text{Type}(u, v)$ of two n -tuples in an ordered graph product F and for any $k < \omega$ there exists a finite ordered graph product $H := H_1 \times \cdots \times H_n$ such that whenever χ is a coloring of the pairs (x, y) in H with $\text{Type}(x, y) = \text{Type}(u, v)$ with k colors, then there is a copy F' of F in H on which the coloring is constant.

To prove the claim, we use induction over n . The induction beginning $n = 1$ is just a subset of the proof of Corollary 16 (as there, we had to introduce an order for the sake of the proof, and now we are already given ordered graphs). So suppose $n > 1$ and that the claim holds for all $i < n$. Let n -tuples $u, v \in F$ defining the type be given. Set $u' := (u_1, \dots, u_{n-1})$, and define v' analogously. By induction hypothesis, there is an ordered graph product $H_1 \times \cdots \times H_{n-1}$ such that whenever its pairs (x', y') with $\text{Type}(x', y') = \text{Type}(u', v')$ are colored with k colors, then there is a copy of $F_1 \times \cdots \times F_{n-1}$ in $H_1 \times \cdots \times H_{n-1}$ on which the coloring is constant. Let m be the number of pairs (x', y') in $H_1 \times \cdots \times H_{n-1}$ which have type $\text{Type}(u', v')$. By induction hypothesis, there is an ordered graph $H_{n,1}$ with the property that whenever its pairs (x_n, y_n) with $\text{Type}(x_n, y_n) = \text{Type}(u_n, v_n)$ are colored with k colors, then it contains a monochromatic copy of F_n . Further, there is an ordered graph $H_{n,2}$ with the property that whenever its subsets of this type are colored with k colors, then it contains a monochromatic copy of $H_{n,1}$. Continue constructing ordered graphs like that, arriving at $H_n := H_{n,m}$. We claim that $H := H_1 \times \cdots \times H_n$ has the desired properties. To see this, let a coloring χ of the pairs of H of type $\text{Type}(u, v)$ be given. Let $(x^1, y^1), \dots, (x^m, y^m)$ be an enumeration of all the pairs in $H_1 \times \cdots \times H_{n-1}$ which have type $\text{Type}(u', v')$. For all $1 \leq i \leq m$, define a coloring χ^i of the pairs (p, q) of H_n of type $\text{Type}(u_n, v_n)$ by setting $\chi^i(p, q) := \chi(x^i \smile p, y^i \smile q)$, where $a \smile b$ denotes the concatenation of two tuples a, b . By thinning out H_n m times, we obtain a copy F'_n of F_n in H_n on which each coloring χ^i is constant with color c^i . Now by that construction, all pairs (x^i, y^i) have been assigned a color c^i , the assignment thus being a coloring of all the pairs of type $\text{Type}(u', v')$ in $H_1 \times \cdots \times H_{n-1}$. By the choice of that product, there is a copy $F'_1 \times \cdots \times F'_{n-1}$ of $F_1 \times \cdots \times F_{n-1}$ in $H_1 \times \cdots \times H_{n-1}$ on which that coloring is constant, say with value r . But that means that if $x, y \in F'_1 \times \cdots \times F'_n$ have type $\text{Type}(u, v)$, then $\chi(x, y) = r$, proving our statement. $\square$

10. MINIMAL BINARY FUNCTIONS

We know from Theorem 40 and Lemma 41 that all essential minimal functions are binary, injective, and preserve both E and N . It is the goal of this section to determine these binary minimal functions.

Let V be equipped with a total order $<$ in such a way that $(V; E, <)$ is the random ordered graph, i.e., the unique countably infinite homogeneous graph containing all finite ordered graphs (for existence and uniqueness of this structure, see e.g. [18]). The order $(V; <)$ is then isomorphic to the order of the rationals $\mathbb{Q}$. We remark that like the unordered random graph, $(V; E, <)$ is ω -categorical as it is homogeneous in a finite relational language.

We henceforth exclusively see the random graph equipped with this order, in particular when talking about canonical behavior of functions on G . Note in this context that a function $f : V^n \rightarrow V$ which is canonical with respect to the language of ordered graphs need not be canonical in the language of ordinary graphs; the converse implication does not hold either.

Proposition 50. *Every function $f : V^n \rightarrow V$ is canonical on arbitrarily large finite ordered graph products. In particular, every binary injection generates a binary injection which is canonical with respect to the language of ordered graphs.*

Proof. The first statement is a direct consequence of the ordered graph product Ramsey lemma (Lemma 49). The second statement follows from the fact that there are only finitely many canonical behaviors on every finite ordered graph product, and by local closure. $\square$

The following is also straightforward to verify.

Proposition 51. *If a function $f : V^n \rightarrow V$ is canonical, then so are all functions it generates.*

Hence, all minimal binary injections are canonical, and we add this to our tacit assumptions on our search for the minimal essential functions. In the following, we determine those canonical behaviors of binary injections that yield minimal functions.

Definition 52. Let $f : V^2 \rightarrow V$, and let $R_1, R_2 \in \{E, N\}$. If for all $(x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2) \in V^2$ with $x_1 \prec y_1, x_2 \prec y_2, R_1(x_1, y_1)$, and $R_2(x_2, y_2)$ we have

- $N(f(x_1, x_2), f(y_1, y_2))$, then we say that f behaves like *min* on input $(\prec, \prec)$.
- $E(f(x_1, x_2), f(y_1, y_2))$, then we say that f behaves like *max* on input $(\prec, \prec)$.
- $R_1(f(x_1, x_2), f(y_1, y_2))$, then we say that f behaves like p_1 on input $(\prec, \prec)$.
- $R_2(f(x_1, x_2), f(y_1, y_2))$, then we say that f behaves like p_2 on input $(\prec, \prec)$.

Analogously, we define behavior on input $(\prec, \succ)$ using pairs $(x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2) \in V^2$ with $x_1 \prec y_1$ and $x_2 \succ y_2$.

Of course, we could also have defined “behavior on input $(\succ, \succ)$ ” and “behavior on input $(\succ, \prec)$ ”; however, behavior on input $(\succ, \succ)$ equals behavior on input $(\prec, \prec)$, and behavior on input $(\succ, \prec)$ equals behavior on input $(\prec, \succ)$. Thus, there are only two kinds of inputs to be considered, namely the “straight input” $(\prec, \prec)$ and the “twisted input” $(\prec, \succ)$.

Proposition 53. *Let $f : V^2 \rightarrow V$ be injective and canonical, and suppose it preserves E and N . Then it behaves like *min*, *max*, p_1 or p_2 on input $(\prec, \prec)$ (and similarly on input $(\prec, \succ)$).*

Proof. By definition of the term canonical; one only needs to enumerate all possible types $\text{Type}(x, y)$ of pairs $x, y \in V^2$. $\square$

We remark that the four possibilities correspond to the four binary operations g on the two-element domain $\{E, N\}$ that are *idempotent*, i.e., that satisfy that $g(E, E) = E$ and $g(N, N) = N$.

Definition 54. If $f : V^2 \rightarrow V$ behaves like X on input $(\prec, \prec)$ and like Y on input $(\prec, \succ)$, where $X, Y \in \{\max, \min, p_1, p_2\}$, then we say that f is of *type* X/Y .

Observe that in Proposition 53, we did not care about the fact that a canonical injection $f : V^2 \rightarrow V$ also behaves regularly with respect to the order: The latter implies, for example, that f is either strictly increasing or decreasing with respect to the pointwise order. Fix from now on any automorphism α of the graph G that reverses the order on V . By applying α to f if necessary, we may assume that f is strictly increasing, which will be a tacit assumption from now on. Having that, one easily checks that f satisfies one of the implications

$$x_1 \prec y_1 \wedge x_2 \neq y_2 \rightarrow f(x_1, x_2) \prec f(y_1, y_2)$$

and

$$x_1 \neq y_1 \wedge x_2 \prec y_2 \rightarrow f(x_1, x_2) \prec f(y_1, y_2).$$

In the first case, we say that f *obeys p_1 for the order*, in the second case f *obeys p_2 for the order*. By switching the variables of f , we may always assume that f obeys p_1 for the order, which we will assume from now on.

We will now prove that minimal binary canonical injections are never of mixed type, i.e., they have to behave the same way on straight and twisted inputs.

Lemma 55. *Suppose that $f : V^2 \rightarrow V$ is injective and canonical, and suppose that it is of type $\max/p_i$ or of type $p_i/\max$, where $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then f is not minimal.*

Proof. We prove that f generates a binary injective canonical function g which is of type $\max/\max$. Clearly, all binary injective canonical functions generated by g then are also of type $\max/\max$, so g cannot generate f , proving the lemma.

Assume wlog that f is of type $\max/p_i$, and note that we assume that f obeys p_1 for the order. Set $h(u, v) := f(u, \alpha(v))$. Then h behaves like p_i on input $(\prec, \prec)$ and like $\max$ on input $(\prec, \succ)$; moreover, $f(x_1, x_2) \prec f(y_1, y_2)$ iff $h(x_1, x_2) \prec h(y_1, y_2)$, for all $x_1 \neq y_1$ and $x_2 \neq y_2$. We then have that $g(u, v) := f(f(u, v), h(u, v))$ is of type $\max/\max$, finishing the proof. $\square$

Lemma 56. *Suppose that $f : V^2 \rightarrow V$ is injective and canonical, and suppose that it is of type $\min/p_i$ or of type $p_i/\min$, where $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then f is not minimal.*

Proof. The dual proof works. $\square$

Lemma 57. *Suppose that $f : V^2 \rightarrow V$ is injective and canonical, and suppose that it is of type $\max/\min$ or of type $\min/\max$. Then f is not minimal.*

Proof. Assume wlog that f is of type $\max/\min$, and remember that we assume that f obeys p_1 for the order. Consider $h(u, v) := f(f(u, v), \alpha(v))$. Then h is of type p_2/p_2 , so it cannot reproduce f . $\square$

Lemma 58. *Suppose that $f : V^2 \rightarrow V$ is injective and canonical, and suppose that it is of type p_1/p_2 or of type p_2/p_1 . Then f is not minimal.*

Proof. If f is of type p_1/p_2 , then $h(u, v) := f(f(u, v), \alpha(v))$ is of type p_2/p_2 and cannot reproduce f . If f is of type p_2/p_1 , then $g(u, v) := f(u, \alpha(v))$ is of type p_1/p_2 and still obeys p_1 for the order; hence, we are back in the first case. $\square$

We have seen that actually no “mixed” types appear for minimal functions. We summarize this fact in the following

Proposition 59. *Let $f : V^2 \rightarrow V$ be canonical and injective. Suppose moreover that f is of type X/Y , where $X, Y \in \{\max, \min, p_1, p_2\}$ and $X \neq Y$. Then f is not minimal.*

This motivates the following definition.

Definition 60. Let $f : V^2 \rightarrow V$. We say that f behaves like $\min(\max, p_1, p_2)$ on input $(\neq, \neq)$ iff it behaves like $\min(\max, p_1, p_2)$ both on input $(\prec, \prec)$ and on input $(\prec, \succ)$. We also say that f is of type $\min(\max, p_1, p_2)$. If f is of type p_1 or p_2 then we also say that f is of type *projection*.

Our observations so far can be summarized as follows.

Proposition 61. *Let $f : V^2 \rightarrow V$ be essential and minimal. Then it is injective, canonical and behaves like $\min, \max, p_1$ or p_2 on input $(\neq, \neq)$.*

In the following, we consider further types of tuples $x, y \in V^2$: So far, we did not look at the case where $x_1 = y_1$ or $x_2 = y_2$.

Definition 62. Let $f : V^2 \rightarrow V$. We say that f behaves like e_E (e_N , id , $-$) on input $(\neq, =)$ iff for every fixed $c \in V$, the function $g(x) := f(x, c)$ behaves like e_E (e_N , id , $-$). Similarly we define behavior on input $(=, \neq)$.

If f is canonical and injective, then it behaves like one of the mentioned functions on input $(\neq, =)$ and $(=, \neq)$, respectively. This motivates the following

Definition 63. We say that $f : V^2 \rightarrow V$ is of type E/N iff f behaves like e_E on input $(\neq, =)$ and like e_N on input $(=, \neq)$. Similarly we define the types E/E , N/E , E/id , $E/-$, etc. Moreover, we say that f is *balanced* iff it is of type id/id , we say it is *E -dominated* iff it is of type E/E , and we say it is *N -dominated* iff it is of type N/N .

In the following theorem, we finally characterize those canonical behaviors that yield minimal functions.

Theorem 64. *The essential minimal operations on the random graph are precisely the binary injective canonical operations of the following types:*

- (1) *Projection and balanced.*
- (2) *max and balanced.*
- (3) *min and balanced.*
- (4) *max and E -dominated.*
- (5) *min and N -dominated.*
- (6) *Projection and E -dominated.*
- (7) *Projection and N -dominated.*
- (8) *p_2 and E/id , or p_1 and id/E .*
- (9) *p_2 and N/id , or p_1 and id/N .*

Moreover, these 9 different kinds of minimal functions do not generate one another. Furthermore, any two functions in the same group do generate one another.

The theorem follows from Proposition 61 and the following lemmas.

Lemma 65. *If f is a binary canonical injection in one of the classes of Theorem 64, then it generates all other functions in the same class.*

Proof. By the homogeneity of G and local closure. □

The verification of Lemmas 66 to 69 is left to the reader; the proof always uses induction over terms.

Lemma 66. *Any binary essential function generated by a binary canonical injection of type min , max , or projection , respectively, is of the same type.*

Lemma 67. *Any binary essential function generated by a binary canonical injection that is balanced and preserves E and N is balanced.*

We thus have that the first three classes of functions of Proposition 64 are indeed minimal. The following lemma proves minimality for items (4) and (5).

Lemma 68. *Any binary essential function generated by an E -dominated binary canonical injection of type max is E -dominated. Dually, any binary essential function generated by an N -dominated binary canonical injection of type min is N -dominated.*

The following lemma proves minimality for items (6) and (7).

Lemma 69. *Any binary essential function generated by an E -dominated binary canonical injection of type projection is E -dominated. Dually, any binary essential function generated by an N -dominated binary canonical injection of type projection is N -dominated.*

It remains to prove minimality for items (8) and (9), which is achieved in the following lemma.

Lemma 70. *Any binary essential function generated by a binary canonical injection of type E/id and p_2 is either of the same type or of type id/E and p_1 . Dually, any binary essential function generated by a binary canonical injection of type N/id and p_2 generates is either of the same type or of type id/N and p_1 .*

Proof. Let $f(u, v)$ be of type E/id and p_2 . $f(v, u)$ is of type id/E and p_1 . Both $f(u, f(u, v))$ and $f(v, f(u, v))$ are of type E/id and p_2 . So is $f(f(u, v), v)$. The function $f(f(u, v), u)$ is of type id/E and p_1 . Finally, $f(f(u, v), f(v, u))$ also is of type id/E and p_1 , so f cannot generate any new typesets. $\square$

Next we claim that no other functions except for those listed in Theorem 64 are minimal. This will be achieved in the following lemmas.

Lemma 71. *Let f be a binary canonical injection of type max . If f is not balanced or E -dominated, then f is not minimal.*

Proof. If f is of type E/id , then $g(x, y) := f(f(x, y), x)$ is E -dominated. By Lemma 68, g cannot reproduce f . If f is of type E/N , then g is E -dominated as well. So it is if f is of type $E/-$.

If f is of type N/id , then $g(x, y) := f(x, f(x, y))$ is balanced, so f is not minimal by Lemma 67. If f is of type $N/-$, then g is balanced as well.

If f is of type $\text{id}/-$ or of type $-/-$, then $g(x, y) := f(x, f(x, y))$ is of type E/id , which we have already shown not to be minimal.

By symmetry, if we switch the arguments in a type of f , e.g., if f is of type id/E , then f is not minimal either. We have thus covered all possible types. $\square$

Lemma 72. *Let f be a binary canonical injection of type min . If f is not balanced or N -dominated, then f is not minimal.*

Proof. By duality. $\square$

Lemma 73. *Let f be a binary canonical injection of type p_1 . If f is not balanced, E -dominated, N -dominated, of type id/E , or of type id/N , then f is not minimal.*

Proof. If f is of type E/id , $E/-$, $-/\text{id}$, or $-/-$, then $g(x, y) := f(x, f(x, y))$ is balanced and cannot reproduce f . If it is of type E/N or $\text{id}/-$, then g is of type E/id , and we are back in the preceding case. Dually, if f is of type N/id or $N/-$, then g is balanced. If it is of type N/E , then g is of type N/id , bringing us back to the preceding case. If it is of type $-/E$, then g is of type id/E and p_1 , and hence cannot reproduce f by Lemma 70. The dual argument works if f is of type $-/N$. $\square$

Lemma 74. *Let f be a binary injection of type p_2 . If f is not balanced, E -dominated, N -dominated, of type E/id , or of type N/id , then f is not minimal.*

Proof. By duality. $\square$

To summarize, we now re-state and prove Theorems 1 and 2 in the following

Theorem 75 (Summary of Theorems 1 and 2). *Any minimal function e on the random graph is equivalent to exactly one of the following operations: a constant operation; e_N ; e_E ; $-$; sw ; or*

- (6) *a binary injection of type p_1 that is balanced in both arguments;*
- (7) *a binary injection of type $\max$ that is balanced in both arguments;*
- (8) *a binary injection of type $\max$ that is E -dominated in both arguments;*
- (9) *a binary injection of type p_1 that is E -dominated in both arguments;*
- (10) *a binary injection of type p_1 that is balanced in the first and E -dominated in the second argument;*

or to one of the duals of the last four operations (the operation in (6) is self-dual).

Proof. If e is not essential, then it generates, and hence is equivalent to, a constant operation, e_N , e_E , $-$ or sw ; this is the content of Theorem 1, which we already proved in Section 7. We also have argued that these functions do not generate each other.

If e is essential, then it must preserve E and N , by Lemma 41, and it must be binary and injective by Theorem 40. By Theorem 64 it must be canonical and of one of the 9 types listed there; moreover, Theorem 64 also shows that functions of different types do not generate each other. Observe that in Theorem 64, class (1) is (6) here, (2) is (7) here, (3) is the dual of (7) here, (4) is (8) here, (5) is the dual of (8) here, (6) is (9) here, (7) is the dual of (9) here, (8) is (10) here, and (9) is the dual of (10) here. $\square$

We conclude this paper by remarking that the relations that are preserved by one of the essential operations in Theorems 1 and 2 (i.e., the relations of the structures in Theorem 8) also have syntactic descriptions. For instance, it is not hard to show (see [3]) that a relation R with a first-order definition in G is preserved by a binary operation of type $\min$ that is N -dominated in both arguments if and only if R can be defined by a quantifier-free Horn formula over $(V; E, =)$ (i.e., by a quantifier-free formula in conjunctive normal form where each clause contains at most one literal of the form $E(x, y)$ or $x = y$).

REFERENCES

- [1] Fred G. Abramson and Leo Harrington. Models without indiscernibles. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 43(3):572–600, 1978.
- [2] Manuel Bodirsky and Hubert Chen. Oligomorphic clones. *Algebra Universalis*, 57(1):109–125, 2007.
- [3] Manuel Bodirsky, Hubie Chen, Jan Kára, and Timo von Oertzen. Maximal infinite-valued constraint languages. *Theoretical Computer Science (TCS)*, 410:1684–1693, 2009. A preliminary version appeared at IICALP’07.
- [4] Manuel Bodirsky, Hubie Chen, and Michael Pinsker. The reducts of equality up to primitive positive interdefinability. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*. to appear. Preprint available from <http://arxiv.org/abs/0810.2270>.
- [5] Manuel Bodirsky, Peter Jonsson, and Timo von Oertzen. Horn versus full first-order: a complexity dichotomy for algebraic constraint satisfaction problems. *Preprint*, 2008.
- [6] Manuel Bodirsky and Jan Kára. The complexity of equality constraint languages. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 3(2):136–158, 2008. A conference version appeared in the proceedings of CSR’06.
- [7] Manuel Bodirsky and Jan Kára. The complexity of temporal constraint satisfaction problems. *Journal of the ACM*, 57(2), 2009. An extended abstract appeared in the proceedings of STOC’08.
- [8] Manuel Bodirsky and Jaroslav Nešetřil. Constraint satisfaction with countable homogeneous templates. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 16(3):359–373, 2006.
- [9] Anthony Bonato and Dejan Delić. The monoid of the random graph. *Semigroup Forum*, 61:138–148, 2000.
- [10] Anthony Bonato, Dejan Delić, and Igor Dolinka. All countable monoids embed into the monoid of the infinite random graph. *Discrete Mathematics*, 310(3):373–375, 2010.

- [11] Andrei Bulatov. A dichotomy theorem for constraint satisfaction problems on a 3-element set. *Journal of the ACM*, 53(1):66–120, 2006.
- [12] Peter J. Cameron. Transitivity of permutation groups on unordered sets. *Math. Z.*, 148:127–139, 1976.
- [13] Peter J. Cameron. *Oligomorphic Permutation Groups*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1990.
- [14] Peter J. Cameron. The random graph. *Algorithms and Combinatorics*, 14:333–351, 1997.
- [15] Peter J. Cameron. The random graph revisited. In *Proceedings of the European Congress of Mathematics*, volume 201, pages 267–274. Birkhäuser, 2001.
- [16] Dejan Delić and Igor Dolinka. The endomorphism monoid of the random graph has uncountably many ideals. *Semigroup Forum*, 69:75–79, 2004.
- [17] Martin Goldstern and Michael Pinsker. A survey of clones on infinite sets. *Algebra Universalis*, 59:365–403, 2008.
- [18] Wilfrid Hodges. *A shorter model theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [19] Markus Junker and Martin Ziegler. The 116 reducts of $(\mathbb{Q}, <, a)$. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 74(3):861–884, 2008.
- [20] Jaroslav Nešetřil. Partitions of finite relational and set systems. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A*, 22(3):289–312, 1977.
- [21] Jaroslav Nešetřil. Ramsey theory. *Handbook of Combinatorics*, pages 1331–1403, 1995.
- [22] Jaroslav Nešetřil and Vojtech Rödl. Ramsey classes of set systems. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A*, 34(2):183–201, 1983.
- [23] Jaroslav Nešetřil and Vojtech Rödl. The partite construction and Ramsey set systems. *Discrete Mathematics*, 75(1-3):327–334, 1989.
- [24] Michael Pinsker. More sublattices of the lattice of local clones. Preprint available from <http://dmg.tuwien.ac.at/pinsker/>, 2008.
- [25] Michael Pinsker. Sublattices of the lattice of local clones. In *Proceedings of the ROGICS’08 conference*, pages 80–87, 2008.
- [26] Reinhard Pöschel and Lev A. Kalužnin. *Funktionen- und Relationenalgebren*. Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1979.
- [27] Thomas J. Schaefer. The complexity of satisfiability problems. In *Proceedings of STOC’78*, pages 216–226, 1978.
- [28] Ágnes Szendrei. *Clones in universal Algebra*. Séminaire de Mathématiques Supérieures. Les Presses de L’Université de Montréal, 1986.
- [29] Simon Thomas. Reducts of the random graph. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 56(1):176–181, 1991.
- [30] Simon Thomas. Reducts of random hypergraphs. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 80(2):165–193, 1996.

LABORATOIRE D’INFORMATIQUE (LIX), CNRS UMR 7161, ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE, 91128 PALAISEAU, FRANCE

E-mail address: bodirsky@lix.polytechnique.fr

URL: <http://www.lix.polytechnique.fr/~bodirsky/>

ÉQUIPE DE LOGIQUE MATHÉMATIQUE, UNIVERSITÉ DENIS-DIDEROT PARIS 7, UFR DE MATHÉMATIQUES, 75205 PARIS CEDEX 13, FRANCE

E-mail address: marula@gmx.at

URL: <http://dmg.tuwien.ac.at/pinsker/>